

# The Review of English Studies

VOL. XI.—No. 44.

OCTOBER, 1935.

## DUMB-SHOW IN ELIZABETHAN DRAMA

BY B. R. PEARN

In this essay it is not purposed to discuss the difficult problem of the origin of dumb-show, whether it was derived from the *inter-medii* of Italian drama or whether from the English Moralities or whether from some other source. It is intended only to consider various cases of dumb-show in Elizabethan drama and to endeavour to deduce some conclusions about the function which dumb-show fulfilled.

The term "dumb-show" is easier to understand than to define, but it might be described as "a part of a play which presents by means of action without speech an element of plot which would more naturally be accompanied by speech." The feature of dumb-show which distinguishes it from, for example, a mere procession or dance or other stage "business" is that it would be more naturally accompanied by vocal acting; thus the coronation procession in *Henry VIII* is not dumb-show, whereas Katharine's dream in the same play is. It must be admitted that the expression "dumb-show" is sometimes used by modern writers to refer to actions which the definition now suggested would exclude, but the definition seems to accord with Elizabethan usage of the expression, and the present consideration of the subject may be restricted to cases which fall within its scope.

There has been a certain amount of misconception about the nature and purpose of dumb-show. In *Shakespeare's England*

(vol. ii., pp. 252 *sqq.*) it is stated that a dumb-show was "a picture-show in which the events of a succeeding scene or act were exhibited beforehand. A 'presenter' introduced them and gave a brief explanation." The writer proceeds to state that dumb-shows disappeared with the advance of play-writing, or survived only in "a modified form of by-play serving to introduce a new scene," and that Ophelia's remarks in *Hamlet* are an indication that dumb-show had passed out of use and was to her a curious revival. We have here three points: first that the function of dumb-show was merely to exhibit beforehand the events of an act or to introduce a scene; second, that there was always a presenter to introduce the shows; and third, that dumb-show had disappeared by the time that *Hamlet* was written or survived only as an introduction to scenes.

To consider the least important of these points first, the introduction by a presenter; fifty-seven cases can be pointed to between the years 1562 and 1626 of plays containing dumb-shows, and a reference has also been found to another play to which access has not been available; there are, no doubt, also other instances which have been overlooked. Disregarding the one to which there has not been access, there are fifty-seven plays, containing a total of over 120 dumb-shows. In these 120 cases, although it commonly happens that the dialogue of the play makes clear the tenor of the dumb-show, it remains that a presenter figures actually in only about one-half of the shows.

To consider next the suggestion that dumb-show fell out of use and was to some extent unusual at the time of the writing of *Hamlet*; of the fifty-seven plays in question, four fall within the decade 1561 to 1570; none at all within the decade 1571 to 1580; four within the decade 1581 to 1590; thirteen within the decade 1591 to 1600; sixteen within the decade 1601 to 1610; fourteen within the decade 1611 to 1620; and six in the succeeding ten years. It would indeed appear from these figures that dumb-show fell out of favour for a time, but it also appears that it came into favour once more and must have been at the height of its popularity at the time when *Hamlet* was written—unless, of course, it be assumed, though there is no reason to assume anything of the sort, that *Hamlet* in the form in which we know it was written during the blank period of the eighth decade of the sixteenth century. Whatever the import of Ophelia's remarks about dumb-show may be, her words are



clearly not to be explained by any surprise on her part at the revival of this instrument of drama.

The most noticeable feature of the chronological distribution of these plays is the long gap between the plays of the seventh and those of the ninth decades of the sixteenth century. Of the four plays of the decade 1561 to 1570, the latest is dated 1567, and of the four plays of the decade 1581 to 1590 the earliest is dated, so far as the date of this play can be ascertained, in the year 1587. Thus there is a gap of no less than some twenty years. But immediately after the conclusion of this blank period, dumb-show returned rapidly and increasingly into favour, reaching a popularity which it had never achieved before. It appears likely that there is a close connection between the renewed popularity of dumb-show and the fact that this first play in which it reappears is the famous *Spanish Tragedy* of Kyd.

Actually, then, dumb-show appears in a few early plays, falls out of use for a time, and reappears to flourish for more than forty years, it being always borne in mind that many plays which, for all one can tell, may have contained dumb-shows, are no longer extant.

To consider now the principal point, the function of dumb-show; its method and object appear to vary in different plays and at different periods. It first appears in early tragedies of the Senecan type, the four plays of the decade 1560 to 1570 being *Gorboduc*, *Jocasta*, *Tancred and Gismund*, and *Appius and Virginia*. In the cases of *Gorboduc*, *Jocasta*, and *Tancred and Gismund*, it seems to be used primarily to enliven the action. The audience of Elizabethan days, it is generally agreed, demanded plenty of movement and life on the stage. But incident was abhorrent to the strict follower of the classical mode. The dumb-show in the plays now under consideration was performed between the acts of the play proper, and not within the acts, and so, while it provided the desired incident, was not strictly part of the play itself, thus avoiding any damage to the susceptibilities of the playwright. Similarly dumb-show provided a highly spectacular item in the programme, not unlike a masque, without, again, encroaching upon the solemnity of the play. At the same time, while the show must not take the form of a part of the play proper, it was naturally desirable that it should be to some extent relevant to the play, and this difficulty was met by making the dumb-show a symbolical comment on the theme of the play. Thus in these early instances

dumb-show provided incident and spectacle, with some bearing on the play but not actually forming part of the play.

In the cases of *Gorboduc* and *Jocasta* each act is preceded by a dumb-show. The following precedes the fourth act of *Gorboduc*:

First the music of hautboys began to play, during which there came from under the stage, as though out of hell, three furies, Alecto, Megera, and Ctesiphone, clad in black garments sprinkled with blood and flames, their bodies girt with snakes, their heads spread with serpents instead of hair; the one bearing in her hand a snake, the other a whip, and the third a burning firebrand; each driving before them a king and a queen, which moved by furies unnaturally had slain their own children. The names of the kings and queens were these, Tantalus, Medea, Athamus, Ino, Cambises, Althea. After that the furies and these had passed about the stage thrice, they departed and then the music ceased. Hereby was signified the unnatural murders to follow, that is to say, Porrex slain by his own mother, and of King Gorboduc and Queen Viden killed by their own subjects.

Again in *Jocasta*, before Act v.:

First the stillpipes sounded a very mournful melody, in which time came upon the stage a woman clothed in a white garment, on her head a pillar, double-faced, the foremost face fair and smiling, the other behind black and louring, muffled with a white lawn about her eyes, her lap full of jewels, sitting in a chariot, her legs naked, her feet set upon a great round ball, and being drawn in by four noble personages; she led in a string on her right hand two kings crowned, and in her left hand two poor slaves very meanly attired. After she was drawn about the stage, she stayed a little, changing the kings unto the left hand and the slaves unto the right hand; taking the crowns from the kings' heads she crowned therewith the two slaves, and casting the vile clothes of the slaves upon the kings, she despoiled the kings of their robes, and therewith apparelled the slaves. This done, she was drawn eftsoons about the stage in this order, and then departed, leaving unto us a plain type or figure of unstable fortune, who does oftentimes raise to the height of dignity the vile and unnoble and in like manner throweth down from the place of promotion even those whom before she herself had thither advanced.

These dumb-shows clearly supply incident and spectacle, with a symbolical comment on the theme of the succeeding acts, in the one case foreshadowing the events of the coming act, and in the other pointing the moral to be drawn from the succeeding events. It may be observed that in these cases the show is accompanied by music appropriate to the theme of the show, and this is definitely stated to be the case in most of the earlier examples of dumb-show,

and was perhaps so general a practice that in many of the later instances the stage-directions do not need expressly to provide for it.

It should be noted that in neither *Gorboduc* nor *Jocasta* is there a presenter. In these two plays there is, indeed, a Chorus, but whereas the dumb-show is performed at the beginning of the act, the Chorus speaks at the end of the act; and though the Chorus does then generally point out the connection between the act and the preceding dumb-show, no such explanation is given at the time when the show is actually being performed. One wonders whether the audience grasped the fact that "the names of the kings and queens were these, Tantalus," etc., or that the show signified "the unnatural murders to follow." On the other hand, these plays were performed for the benefit of an educated audience who might be expected to have greater powers of apprehension than would the audience of the popular theatre; in any case, the desire for movement and spectacle was satisfied, and the audience perhaps regarded the show merely as an extra item of entertainment, not caring whether it bore on the play or not, much as some of the Italian *intermedii* had no relevance to the plays between whose acts they were performed.

In the case of *Tancred and Gismund*, the dumb-shows are somewhat different, since they are performed by allegorical figures such as Cupid in conjunction with the characters of the play proper; but again the shows, of which there are four, foreshadow the general theme of the succeeding acts.

The case of *Appius and Virginia* is also different. In this play, at the point at which Appius is debating whether he shall or shall not carry out his scheme against Virginia, we find the following stage-direction,

Let Conscience and Justice come out after him, and let Conscience hold at his hand a lamp burning, and let Justice have a sword and hold it before Appius' breast.

If we regard this as an instance of dumb-show with Appius acting in a way as presenter, we find that the show is used to convey, by means of pictorial representation, the state of mind of Appius to the audience. There is little that is spectacular about it, and it conveys no information that could not equally well be gathered from Appius' words. It may be, however, that an audience more

familiar with the Morality play than with the new drama could more readily grasp the point of the argument when it was presented to them with the accompaniment of the symbolical figures to which they were accustomed than when they had only the spoken word to guide them. This same explanation may apply to some extent to the other cases of dumb-show so far noted. An audience accustomed to the symbolical characters of the Moralities could readily understand the meaning of figures representing Fortune, Charity, or Lust, for example; and when, on the other hand, the Moralities began to be forgotten, symbolical dumb-show would cease to appeal to the audience, and would disappear from the stage.

There is a late instance of dumb-show somewhat similar to that of *Appius and Virginia* in Markham and Sampson's *Herod and Antipater* (1621), where the allegorical figures of the dumb-show deposit a scroll at the feet of Antipater, who then reads it aloud to the audience. This is done twice in the play.

Dumb-show does not appear in any extant play for twenty years after the date of *Appius and Virginia*. It then reappears in *The Spanish Tragedy*, where there are two shows, one being symbolical and one serving a different purpose. It will be observed that the system of including a dumb-show in conjunction with every act of the play was not adopted by Kyd. The regular five-act distribution, however, is found again almost contemporaneously with *The Spanish Tragedy* in *The Misfortunes of Arthur* (1588). Here again we have a strictly classical play, with once more an allegorical dumb-show at the beginning of each act to point the theme of the action which follows. Again the Chorus speaks at the end of the acts, and gives little clue to the sense of the shows, though the remarks of a Nuntius shed some light on their purport. The spectacular element is again apparent. Similar allegorical comments on the main action are found in *Lochrine* (1591), but in this case the play was probably intended for performance on the popular stage, and so for the first time we find a presenter in the person of Atey, who explains the implications of each show immediately after it has been performed.

The inclination for symbolical dumb-show, however, was evidently disappearing, just as the academic play in which it figures was disappearing, though in a few cases we find this type of show surviving in plays of a more robust nature. The practice of

attaching a dumb-show to every act likewise did not persist, for in only one case after *Lochrine* do we find a show accompanying every act of a regular five-act play, viz. in Heywood's *Golden Age* (1611), where, curiously enough, the show is performed at the end of each act, and not, in the earlier manner, at the beginning. Moreover, in this case the figures which participate in the show are not symbolical. In all the other cases which remain to be considered, the number of shows varies from play to play.

Apart from *Gorboduc*, *Jocasta*, *Lochrine*, and *The Misfortunes of Arthur*, purely symbolical dumb-show appears in only six cases, and in none of these is there a show attached to every act. The plays in question are *The Spanish Tragedy*, Peele's *Battle of Alcazar* (1589), Greene's *James IV* (1591), Rowley's *Birth of Merlin* (1597), Dekker's *Whore of Babylon* (1607), and Beaumont and Fletcher's *Four Plays in One* (1608). In all these instances the dumb-show is used sparingly. In the first case, *The Spanish Tragedy*, two torch-bearers enter, bearing nuptial torches; they are followed by Hymen, clothed in black and saffron, who quenches the torches in blood. Revenge and the Ghost of Andrea act as presenters, and by their dialogue convey to the audience the information that the show represents the bringing about of the *dénouement* of the play by the marriage festivities of Balthazar and Bel-imperia. Little purpose is served by this show, except that the gloomy figure of Hymen and the plunging out of the torches emphasize the atmosphere of horror. In *The Battle of Alcazar* there are, as in *The Spanish Tragedy*, two dumb-shows, of which one is symbolical, representing the fall of the kings of Barbary and Portugal; in *James IV* we have a show which symbolizes the vanity of earthly greatness; in *The Birth of Merlin* there are also two dumb-shows, one only being symbolical, and representing the life and death of the son of Uther Pendragon. In all these instances the shows are introduced by presenters. The spectacular element is in general predominant in these cases; but while the demand for spectacle persisted, it would appear that by the last decade of the century popular taste had, despite the example of *The Spanish Tragedy*, become impatient of the purely symbolical dumb-show; for only two plays containing such shows appear after the date of *The Birth of Merlin* (1597), and both of these plays, *The Whore of Babylon* and *Four Plays in One*, are highly allegorical throughout, thus standing somewhat apart from the ordinary drama. Instead, we



find a rapid increase in the number of shows of a new type, in which only characters of the main play participate, a type of show which had made its first appearance in *The Battle of Alcazar*.

The appearance of this new type of dumb-show indicates that, instead of being merely a comment of some kind on the play proper, the dumb-show was becoming an integral part of the play itself. We find, however, one or two shows of an intermediate type. The performance of dumb-shows in which both allegorical figures and characters of the play proper participate has been noted already in the case of *Tancred and Gismund*, and also in a way in *Appius and Virginia*, and, much later, in *Herod and Antipater*. In 1599 appeared a play containing dumb-shows which are much more definitely transition shows of this nature, viz. *A Warning for Fair Women*. This anonymous play is a domestic tragedy, revolving around the murder of a husband by his wife's lover with her connivance. There are three dumb-shows, to which Tragedy acts as presenter. These shows display the state of mind of the principal characters and yet also to some extent symbolize the action which is to follow. The following is the first of the three shows.

Tragedy has summoned the principal characters to the scene, and as they approach

Some strange solemn music like bells is heard within. The Furies go to the door and meet them: first the Furies enter before, leading them, dancing a soft dance to the solemn music: next comes Lust before Browne, leading Mistress Sanders covered with a black veil: Chastity, all in white, pulling her back softly by the arm: then Drewry, thrusting away Chastity, Roger following. They march about, and then sit to the table. The Furies fill wine, Lust drinks to Browne, he to Mistress Sanders; she pledgeth him. Lust embraceth her, she thrusteth Chastity from her, Chastity wrings her hands, and departs. Drewry and Roger embrace one another; the Furies leap and embrace one another.

Then, after Tragedy has explained that this represents Mistress Sanders' fall from virtue, instigated by Roger and Mistress Drewry, they fall asleep, and Tragedy pours blood on their hands as a sign of the murder they are about to commit.

Before leaving these allegorical dumb-shows we may sum up their purpose by saying that they served to satisfy the desire for incident and spectacle, and perhaps also to help the audience to understand the arguments and long speeches to which these early plays are sometimes prone. They also served as a comment on the



events of the play, to indicate the moral which was to be drawn from these events. But they do not assist the development of the plot.

Besides these symbolical dumb-shows, nearly all of which occur in plays written before the year 1600, there can be found, both in the earlier period and also in the period subsequent to the year 1600, one or two cases in which the device is used for another, but sometimes closely related, purpose. It is used as a means of representing dreams and visions. The number of extant plays containing dumb-shows of this nature is eight, viz. Lyly's *Endimion* (1588), Rowley's *Birth of Merlin* (1597), Munday's *Death of Robert Earl of Huntingdon* (1598), Heywood's *If You Know Not Me You Know Nobody* (1605), Webster's *White Devil* (1612), *Henry VIII* (1613), the 1616 version of *Dr. Faustus*, where the dumb-show is expanded from a simple stage-direction in the earlier versions, and Massinger's *Roman Actor* (1626). The dreams in two of these cases, *Endimion* and *Henry VIII*, are represented in dumb-shows performed by allegorical figures, and in neither case is the show essential to the progress of the play. In the case of *Endimion* the stage-direction for the show runs as follows :

Music sounds. Three ladies enter, one with a knife and a looking-glass, who by procurement of one of the other two offers to stab Endimion as he sleeps, but the third wrings her hands, lamenteth, offering still to prevent it, but dares not. At last the first lady, looking in the glass, casts down the knife. Exeunt. Enters an ancient man with books with three leaves ; offers the same twice. Endimion refuseth ; he rendeth two and offers the third, where he stands awhile, and then Endimion offers to take it. Exit.

It is difficult to perceive the purport of this show, and no clue is provided until the last act of the play, although the show is performed in Act II. In the case of *Henry VIII*, Katharine, in the last scene in which she appears, immediately prior to her death, falls asleep and dreams as follows :

Enter, solemnly tripping one after another, six personages, clad in white robes, wearing on their heads garlands of bays, and golden vizards on their faces ; branches of bays or palm in their hands. They first congee unto her, then dance ; and, at certain changes, the first two hold a spare garland over her head ; at which the other four make reverent curtsies ; then the two that held the garland deliver the same to the other next two, who observe the same order in their changes, and holding the garland over her head : which done, they deliver the same garland

to the last two, who likewise observe the same order : at which, as it were by inspiration, she makes in her sleep signs of rejoicing, and holdeth up her hands to heaven ; and so in their dancing vanish, carrying the garland with them. The music continues.

The show is obviously an allegorical foreshadowing of the happiness which Katharine is to find in the future life to which she is about to go. Again, the omission of the dumb-show would not damage the unity of the play ; its presence is a concession to the popular liking for spectacle, music, and dancing.

In *The Death of Robert Earl of Huntingdon* we find a dumb-show in which is represented a dream of King John's ; it contains action by both allegorical figures and characters from the main play ; and its object is, apparently, to indicate the character of John and also to show the general disposition of the characters of the play at the early stage in the action at which it appears. In this case there is a presenter to introduce and expound the show.

The case of *If You Know Not Me* is somewhat different, since here the show has a closer connection with the action of the plot. *If You Know Not Me* is a play dealing with the troubles of the Princess Elizabeth during the reign of her sister Mary. While Elizabeth is in the custody of one Benningfield, she dreams as follows :

Enter Winchester, Constable, Barwick, and Friars. At the other door two Angels. The Friars step to her, offering to kill her ; the Angels drive them back. Exeunt. The Angel opens the Bible, and puts it in her hand as she sleeps. Exeunt Angel.

When Elizabeth wakes, she is surprised to find the Bible in her hands ; and on looking at it discovers that it is open at the words " Whoso putteth his trust in the Lord shall not be confounded." Although there is no presenter to expound the import of this show, its meaning is sufficiently clear. It indicates that the Catholic party was plotting in some way to compass Elizabeth's death, but that divine intervention would preserve her ; and the attempt to execute the plot and its frustration almost by chance are the theme of a scene performed in the ordinary way later in the play. To a certain extent the show is significant of the subsequent action, as well as indicating to the audience that the princess is under divine protection ; and in this respect the dumb-show symbolizes the subsequent action and also forms a comment on the situation, somewhat like the allegorical shows already considered.

In the case of *The Birth of Merlin*, *The White Devil*, and *Dr. Faustus*, the dumb-show is the means of representing visions which a magician conjures up for the benefit of characters in the play. Here the dumb-show may serve not for purposes of comment on the play but as part of the play proper. In *The White Devil*, for example, a magician evokes two visions which reveal certain events of major importance in the play, the murders of Isabella and Camillo. There is no symbolism or allegory; the dumb-shows are performed by the characters of the play, and the murders are essential parts of the development of the plot. The magician may be regarded as exercising something of the function of the Nuntius of classical drama.

In these cases of dumb-shows portraying dreams and visions, then, the purpose served may be much the same as in the case of the symbolical shows, viz. to add to the spectacular element in the play, and to act in some degree as a comment on the events of the play; but it may also serve as an integral part of the play and be used to help forward the action.

The performance of dreams and visions in this way has the very great advantage that the unusual mode of representation emphasises the distinction between the vision and the rest of the play.

The majority of dumb-shows, however, are not symbolical, nor are they a means of representing dreams and visions. They are performed only by characters of the main play, and they contribute directly to the advance of the action. They are, in fact, additional scenes, sometimes prologues and sometimes integral parts of the play, differing from the principal scenes only in that they are acted by the performers without the accompaniment of speech. Of the total of fifty-seven plays under consideration, no less than forty contain shows falling within this category. The following are the plays in question: *The Battle of Alcazar* (1589), Heywood's *Four Prentices of London* (1592), Middleton's *Mayor of Queenborough* (1596), the anonymous *Captain Thomas Stukeley* (1596), Munday's *Downfall of Robert Earl of Huntingdon* (1598), Marston's *Antonio's Revenge* (1599), Heywood's *A Maidenhead Well Lost* (1599), the anonymous play *The Weakest Goeth to the Wall* (1600), Webster and Rowley's *Thracian Wonder* (1600), Marston's *What You Will* (1601), Heywood's *Fair Maid of the West* (1603), Middleton's *Phoenix* (1603), Marston's *Fawn* (1604), *The First Part of Jeronimo* (1604), Marston's *Malcontent* (1604), Heywood's *If You Know Not*

*Me* (1605), Marston's *Wonder of Women* (1606), Tourneur's *Revenger's Tragedy* (1606), Day's *Travels of Three English Brothers* (1607), Barnes's *Devil's Charter* (1607), Dekker's *Whore of Babylon* (1607), *Pericles* (1608), Beaumont and Fletcher's *Four Plays in One* (1608), Marston's *Insatiate Countess* (1610), Daborne's *Christian Turned Turk* (1611), Heywood's *Golden Age* (1611), Field's *Woman is a Weathercock* (1611), Middleton's *Chaste Maid in Cheapside* (1611), Heywood's *Silver Age* (1612), the anonymous *Match Me in London* (1612), Heywood's *Brazen Age* (1613), Webster's *Duchess of Malfi* (1614), Beaumont and Fletcher's *Faithful Friends* (1614) and their *Queen of Corinth* (1618), the anonymous *Bloody Banquet* (1620), Markham and Sampson's *Herod and Antipater* (1621), Beaumont and Fletcher's *Prophetess* (1622), Dekker's *Wonder of a Kingdom* (1623), Middleton's *Changeling* (1623) and his *Game at Chess* (1624).

The dates of these plays indicate, as has already been pointed out, that this form of dumb-show appeared at a time when the allegorical form had lost such hold as it ever had on popular favour, and that the new form retained its popularity almost throughout the whole period of Elizabethan drama.

To consider these shows in some detail ; only one of the plays, *The Golden Age*, is regular in having a dumb-show attached to every act. In the remaining thirty-nine plays there is a good deal of variation in the number of shows in each play. There is also a good deal of variation in the elaboration and importance of the shows. In *The Fair Maid of the West*, for example, we have the following :

A dumb-show. Enter General, Captains, the Mayor : Petitioners the other way with papers : among these the Drawers. The General gives them bags of money. All go off saving two Drawers.

This is trivial, and has little bearing on the action of the play ; it does little more than enable the drawers to comment, more or less humorously, on the surprising fact that a general has paid his debts. It does not appear to have even the merit of being spectacular. It is an unimportant item in the story which the play is telling, and might well have been omitted.

Again, *The First Part of Jeronimo* opens with a dumb-show of Jeronimo being created Marshal of Spain.

Sound a signet and pass over the stage. Enter at one door the King of Spain, Duke of Castile, Duke Medina, Lorenzo and Rogero : at another door, Andrea, Horatio, and Jeronimo. Jeronimo kneels down, and the King creates him Marshal of Spain ; Lorenzo puts on his spurs,

and Andrea his sword. The King goeth along with Jeronimo to his house. After a long signet is sounded, enter all the nobles, with covered dishes, to the banquet. Exeunt Omnes. That done, enter all again as before.

This show conveys little information to the audience, and does little to move forward the action of the play; but on the other hand it is essentially spectacular.

As against this, we have shows of considerable elaboration which also convey important information to the audience. For example, *The Devil's Charter* opens with a prologue spoken by the figure of the historian, Guicciardini, who introduces and expounds the following dumb-show :

At one door betwixt two other cardinals, Roderigo in his purple habit close in conference with them; one of which he guideth to a tent, where a table is furnished with divers bags of money, which that cardinal beareth away; and to another tent the other cardinal, where he delivereth him a great quantity of rich plate; embraces, with joining of hands. Exeunt Cardinals; Manet Roderigo. To whom from another place a monk, with a magical book and rod, in private whispering with Roderick, whom the monk draweth to a chair in midst of the stage which he circleth, and before it another circle, into which (after semblance of reading with exorcism) appear exhalations of lightning and sulphurous smoke, in midst whereof a devil in most ugly shape; from which Roderigo turneth his face. He being conjured down after more thunder and fire, ascends another devil like a sergeant, with a mace under his girdle; Roderigo disliketh. He descendeth. After more thunder and fearful fire, ascend in robes pontifical with a triple crown on his head and cross keys in his hand; a devil him ensuing in black robes like a pronotary, a cornered cap on his head, a box of lancets at his girdle, a little piece of fine parchment in his hand; who being brought unto Alexander, he willingly receiveth him; to whom he delivereth the writing, which seeming to read, presently the pronotary strippeth up Alexander's sleeve and letteth his arm blood in a saucer, and having taken a piece from the pronotary, subscribeth to the parchment, delivereth it. The remainder of the blood the other devil seemeth to sup up, and from him disrobed is put the rich cap, the tunicle, and the triple crown set upon Alexander's head, the cross keys delivered into his hands; and withal a magical book. This done, with thunder and lightning the devils descend. Alexander advanceth himself and departeth.

In this dumb-show we have plenty of elaborate spectacle and incident, but we are also given information about the character of the principal personage of the play, Roderigo Borgia, afterwards Pope Alexander VI; we are informed of the general tone of the play, and of certain facts antecedent to the events of the first act;



and we are prepared for the *dénouement* when Borgia is carried off by devils. The show forms a striking prologue to the play, and is perhaps the more impressive in that it is acted in silence.

Obviously, then, from these three examples, even when the dumb-show is concerned closely with the action of the play, it can fulfil more than one function.

In some cases plays contain dumb-shows which act as prologues; this applies to nine cases, viz. *The Battle of Alcazar*, *The Downfall of Robert Earl of Huntingdon*, *The Weakest Goeth to the Wall*, *The First Part of Jeronimo*, *The Wonder of Women*, *The Travels of Three English Brothers*, *The Devil's Charter*, *The Whore of Babylon*, and *The Bloody Banquet*. In all these cases the show imparts to the audience some information, though not always very much, about the characters of the play or the events which precede the beginning of the play proper; information which would otherwise have to be given at length during the course of the action. In the case of *The Battle of Alcazar*, for instance, we have a prologue in dumb-show depicting the murder of Abdelmunem and his two nephews by Muly Mahamet, the crime which produces the civil war which is the theme of the play. *The Travels of Three English Brothers*, again, is preceded by a dumb-show setting forth the three brothers' leave-taking of their father before departing on the adventures with which the play is concerned; and the dumb-show prologue to *The Weakest Goeth to the Wall* shows the murder of the Duke of Burgundy, the crime which, as in the case of *The Battle of Alcazar*, is the motive for the civil war which occupies the play. And similarly with the other plays mentioned. The shows are not invariably particularly spectacular; but in their object they are not altogether unlike the symbolical shows of the early plays, since they again play the part of prologues, the difference being that they provide information where the symbolical shows provide comment; they have, however, a much closer connection with the plays to which they are attached than have the allegorical shows, since they could be performed in full as integral scenes of the plays without disturbing the unity of these plays.

In a few cases also we find dumb-shows serving as prologues of a sort to individual scenes and not to the whole play, the purpose they serve being primarily to bring the characters into the necessary positions on the stage for the ensuing scene without the delay which would be caused by ordinary entrances with spoken accom-



paniments. In Marston's play *The Fawn* we find the following before the first scene of Act v. :

While the act is playing, Hercules and Tiberio enters ; Tiberio climbs the tree, and is received above by Dulcimet, Philocalia, and a Priest : Hercules stays beneath.

The expression " the act is playing " refers to the playing of music during the interval between the fourth and fifth acts.<sup>1</sup> In this case immediately after this silent performance Hercules continues his performance on the stage in soliloquy until the entrance of further characters. Similar introductions to scenes are found in *What You Will*, *The Phoenix*, and *The Malcontent*, all of which but one are written by Marston, who was evidently fond of this device. In none of these cases is there a presenter. Although these shows are little more than somewhat elaborate stage " business," they do nevertheless consist of matter which would normally be accompanied by speech, even if only by a few words, and thus come just within the limits of our definition. These shows appear to be the " modified form of by-play " referred to in *Shakespeare's England*.

The majority of these dumb-shows which are performed by characters of the main play, however, are simply ordinary scenes, forming integral parts of the play, and carrying on the action of the plot in a normal way like any other scene, except that they are acted without speech. Dumb-shows of this type are found in thirty-one of the forty plays now under consideration, viz. *The Four Prentices of London*, *The Mayor of Queenborough*, *Captain Thomas Stukeley*, *Antonio's Revenge*, *A Maidenhead Well Lost*, *The Thracian Wonder*, *The Fair Maid of the West*, *If You Know Not Me*, *The Revenger's Tragedy*, *The Travels of Three English Brothers*, *The Devil's Charter*, *The Whore of Babylon*, *Pericles*, *Four Plays in One*, *The Insatiate Countess*, *A Christian Turned Turk*, *The Golden Age*, *Woman is a Weathercock*, *A Chaste Maid in Cheapside*, *The Silver Age*, *Match Me in London*, *The Brazen Age*, *The Duchess of Malfi*, *The Faithful Friends*, *The Queen of Corinth*, *The Bloody Banquet*, *Herod and Antipater*, *A Game at Chess*, *The Prophetess*, *The Wonder of a Kingdom*, and *The Changeling*.

In each of these cases the dumb-show carries forward the action of the plot. In *The Mayor of Queenborough*, for example, the whole of the execution of the conspiracy to murder Constantius and promote Vortiger in his place, and again the whole of the conspiracy

<sup>1</sup> W. J. Lawrence : *Elizabethan Playhouse*, i., p. 76-7.

which results in the murder of Vortimer and the promotion once more of Vortiger, are shown entirely by means of dumb-show. An example of this style of show which carries forward the action of the plot may be taken from *Captain Thomas Stukeley* :

Enter at one door Philip, King of Spain, Alva and soldiers. They take their stand. Then enter another way Sebastian, Don Antonio, Averro, with drums and ensigns. They likewise take their stand. After some pause Antonio is sent forth to Philip, who with obeisance done approaching, away again very disdainfully ; and as the Spanish soldiers are about to follow Antonio, Philip with his drawn sword stops them, and so departs. Whereat Sebastian makes a show of great displeasure, but whispering with his lords, each encouraging other, as they are about to depart. Enter Stukeley and his Italian band, who keeping aloof, Sebastian sends Antonio to him, with whom Stukeley draws near toward the king ; and having a while conferred, at last retires to his soldiers, to whom he makes show of persuading them to join with the Portuguese. At first they seem to dislike, but last they yield, and so both armies meeting, embrace ; when, with a sudden thunder-clap, the sky is one fire, and the blazing star appears, which they prognosticating to be fortunate, departed very joyful.

This show communicates to the audience the whole of the series of events which led Stukeley to divert his forces from the proposed conquest of Ireland to the assistance of the Portuguese, who were seeking allies in their projected descent on Morocco, the Spanish King having failed to send the forces he had promised. The import of the show is explained by a presenter.

In the anonymous *Bloody Banquet*, we have the following at the end of the second act :

Enter the old Queen weeping, with both her infants, the one dead ; she lays down the other on a bank, and goes to bury the dead, expressing much grief. Enter the former shepherds, walking by carelessly. At last they espy the child and strive for it ; at last the clown gets it, and dandles it, expressing all signs of joy to them. Enter again the Queen ; she looks for her babe and finds it gone, wrings her hands. The shepherds see her, then whisper together, then beckon to her. She joyfully runs to them ; they return her child ; she points to her breasts, as meaning she should nurse it. They all give her money ; the clown kisses the babe and her ; and so Exeunt several ways. Then enter Lapius, the old King, Amorpho, and Fidelio. They miss the Queen, and so expressing great sorrow, Exeunt.

Once more we have action which is an essential part of the development of the plot indicated in the form of dumb-show. In

this case also there is a chorus to expound the meaning of the show. Similar cases will be found in all the other plays included in this group. In these instances the show is in effect a separate scene of the main play, contributing directly towards the progress of the action. In only about one-half of the sixty dumb-shows of this type is there a presenter to expound to the audience the implications of the show; in the remaining cases the purport of the show is made clear by the context.

The dumb-show when performed by the characters of the main play thus may fulfil one of three functions; it may serve as a prologue to the whole play, it may be a means of bringing the characters of the succeeding scene on to the stage, or it may serve as a silent form of an ordinary scene. All of this, however, might be effected by means of spoken action. What then was the special advantage possessed by the method of representation in dumb-show? In the case of the symbolical shows, the unusual form of presentation helped to make the induction distinct from the play proper; in the case of dreams and visions a similar distinction was marked by the absence of dialogue. But where lay the advantage of using dumb-show in presenting what was in effect an ordinary scene? Leaving aside the minor cases in which the dumb-show serves only to bring the characters of the succeeding scene on to the stage, we may conclude that in some ways the object of shows of this type was not entirely dissimilar to the object of the early allegorical shows. It is true that the changes which had taken place in the style of play-writing had left no room for the use of dumb-show as an explanation of or comment on the main section; but it could still provide two things, spectacle and incident. While the plays included in the group now under discussion did not suffer by any means from the paucity of incident which characterizes the early classical drama, it remains that the Elizabethan audience thirsted for movement and lively action, and the dumb-show provided the dramatist with an easy means of satisfying this desire to a greater extent than was possible by ordinary methods. In *The Prophetess* we have a frank explanation of this point. When the Chorus is about to introduce the dumb-show, he says:

So full of matter is our history,  
Yet mixed, I hope, with sweet variety,  
The accidents now vulgar too, but rare,  
And fit to be presented, that there wants

Room in this narrow stage, and time to express  
 In action to the life, our Dioclesian  
 In his full lustre ; yet (as the statuary,  
 That by the large size of Alcides' foot,  
 Guess'd at his whole proportion) so we hope  
 Your apprehensive judgements will conceive  
 Out of the shadow we can only show,  
 How fair the body was ; and will be pleas'd,  
 Out of your wonted goodness, to behold  
 As in a silent mirror, what we cannot  
 With fit conveniency of time, allow'd  
 For such presentments, clothe in vocal sounds.  
 Yet with such art the subject is convey'd,  
 That every scene and passage shall be clear  
 Even to the grossest understanding here.

This is clear enough ; there is not sufficient time to represent the events of the play in full, and so they must be represented without the check on the rapidity of performance which would be imposed by spoken acting. The dumb-show, then, is a device by means of which the dramatist can cram more incident into his play than would be possible by normal methods, and was therefore especially useful in plays which were dramas of incident rather than dramas of character. Dumb-shows would be of little assistance in a play whose object was primarily to portray the development of character ; it can convey action, but it cannot directly convey the thoughts in the minds of the personages of the play. Hence dumb-show appears most in plays which answer the popular demand for incident and also for spectacle ; but it is rare in plays which fulfil a higher function. It appears to have been especially favoured by the mass of the audience, the "groundlings" of *Hamlet*, who no doubt enjoyed the cramming of as much incident and spectacle as possible into their afternoon's amusement.

Thus the general function of dumb-show is much the same at the end as at the beginning of our period. Though the allegorical show has been superseded and the dumb-show has tended to become more and more an integral part of the play, it continues in use in one form or another as a means of providing the audience with incident and spectacle. The particular purpose of dumb-show, however, varies ; it may provide a symbolical comment on the theme of the play, it may provide a convenient means of representing dreams and visions, it may fulfil the function of a prologue or scene of the ordinary type, or it may be a means of placing characters in

the required position on the stage without the delay caused by spoken acting. Whatever its purpose, it seems to have remained popular almost throughout the Elizabethan age of drama.

There yet remain, however, two cases more of dumb-show, one of them the most important of all. In these two cases, *The Spanish Tragedy* and *Hamlet*, we find the dumb-show used in a manner different from those already considered. In the former case there is, besides the symbolical show of Hymen already mentioned, a dumb-show which plays the part of an entertainment for the amusement of the personages of the main play. The dumb-show which Hieronimo introduces soon after the beginning of the play has no bearing on the main action with the important exception that Hieronimo's rôle as presenter is a preparation for the part he plays as producer and actor in the more famous drama which is enacted within the last act of the *Tragedy*. In itself the show was probably merely an addition to the spectacular side of the play, for the Spanish King's remark, "this maske contents mine eye," indicates that the show was more elaborate than the meagre stage-directions suggest; and also, rather irrelevantly, the show no doubt gratified the somewhat crude patriotism of the audience.

The dumb-show in *Hamlet* is likewise in the form of an entertainment for the benefit of the characters of the main play; but in this case the show is, as is well known, by no means irrelevant to the action of the play. It differs in a still more material way from the show in *The Spanish Tragedy* in that it is prefixed to another play within the main play, and does not stand by itself as the whole of the entertainment. Regarded as dumb-show it should be considered primarily in relation to the entertainment to which it is the prefix.

The familiar controversy which has arisen over this dumb-show has its origin in the fact that the show rehearses, without words, exactly the action which is immediately afterwards repeated in dialogue. In this respect the dumb-show in *Hamlet* is unique. It can fall within none of the categories among which other dumb-shows can be classified. It is true that the earliest examples of dumb-show also foreshadow the theme of the play, but this is invariably effected by means of symbolism, whereas in *Hamlet* there is no symbolism. There is no other instance of a dumb-show which enacts in silence exactly the action which is afterwards repeated in vocal acting. It is, of course, possible that there may

have been a similar case in some play which is no longer extant, but since we find no other such instance among the 120 dumb-shows which appear in the fifty-seven plays now under discussion, it seems more likely that this is not the case. At very least, the show in *Hamlet* must be regarded as most unusual. But to attempt to solve the familiar problems which arise from the consideration of this dumb-show would be beyond the scope of this essay.

In conclusion, the question of dumb-show is a difficult one, which would repay very careful and detailed consideration. The classification which has been here attempted is admittedly a rough one; and a more detailed consideration of the subject would no doubt result in a subdivision into more numerous and more accurately distinguished classes.

#### BIBLIOGRAPHY.

There is a brief but excellent article on dumb-show by Mr. F. A. Foster in *Englische Studien*, vol. 44 (1911). The origin of dumb-show is discussed in Cunliffe, *Early English Classical Tragedies*, pp. xxxix sqq., and in E. K. Chambers, *Elizabethan Stage*, i., p. 185. There is also useful information in Creizenach, *English Drama in the Age of Shakespeare*, pp. 276, 388; Welsford, *Court Masque*, pp. 292 sqq.; and W. J. Lawrence, *Elizabethan Playhouse*, i., p. 76, ii., p. 167.

#### LIST OF PLAYS.

- 1562 Sackville and Norton, *Gorboduc*.
- 1566 Gascoigne, *Jocasta*.  
*Tancred and Gismund*.
- 1567 R. B., *Appius and Virginia*.
- 1587 Kyd, *Spanish Tragedy*.
- 1588 Hughes, *Misfortunes of Arthur*.  
*Lyly, Endimion*.
- 1589 Peele, *Battle of Alcazar*.
- 1591 *Lochrine*.  
Greene, *James IV*.
- 1592 Heywood, *Four Prentices of London*.
- 1596 Middleton, *Mayor of Queenborough*.  
*Captain Thomas Stukeley*.
- 1597 Rowley, *Birth of Merlin*.
- 1598 Munday, *Downfall of Robert Earl of Huntingdon*.  
Munday, *Death of Robert Earl of Huntingdon*.
- 1599 Marston, *Antonio's Revenge*.  
Heywood, *Maidenhead Well Lost*.  
*Warning for Fair Women*.



- 1600 *Weakest Goeth to the Wall.*  
Webster and Rowley, *Thracian Wonder.*
- 1601 Marston, *What You Will.*
- 1602 Shakespeare, *Hamlet.*
- 1603 Heywood, *Fair Maid of the West.*  
Middleton, *Phœnix.*
- 1604 Marston, *Fawn.*  
*First Part of Jeronimo.*  
Marston, *Malcontent.*
- 1605 Heywood, *If You Know Not Me.*
- 1606 Marston, *Wonder of Women.*  
Tournear, *Revenger's Tragedy.*
- 1607 Day, *Travels of Three English Brothers.*  
Barnes, *Devil's Charter.*  
Dekker, *Whore of Babylon.*
- 1608 Shakespeare, *Pericles.*  
Beaumont and Fletcher, *Four Plays in One.*
- 1610 Marston, *Insatiate Countess.*
- 1611 Daborne, *Christian Turned Turk.*  
Heywood, *Golden Age.*  
Field, *Woman is a Weathercock.*  
Middleton, *Chaste Maid in Cheapside.*
- 1612 Heywood, *Silver Age.*  
Webster, *White Devil.*  
*Match Me in London.*
- 1613 Heywood, *Brazen Age.*  
Shakespeare, *Henry VIII.*
- 1614 Webster, *Duchess of Malfi.*  
Beaumont and Fletcher, *Faithful Friends.*
- 1616 Marlowe, *Doctor Faustus.*
- 1618 Beaumont and Fletcher, *Queen of Carthage.*
- 1620 *Bloody Banquet.*
- 1621 Markham and Sampson, *Herod and Antipater.*
- 1622 Beaumont and Fletcher, *Prophetess.*
- 1623 Middleton, *Changeling.*  
Dekker, *Wonder of a Kingdom.*
- 1624 Middleton, *Game at Chess.*
- 1626 Massinger, *Roman Actor.*

## JOHN SKELTON: A GENEALOGICAL STUDY

By H. L. R. EDWARDS

### § 1

POETS are rarely blessed with the appreciation that his age accorded Skelton; and his prominence at Court seems to assure the biographer, who has to hand the "most magnificent body of materials for the history of any reign, ancient or modern,"<sup>1</sup> a substantial groundwork of fact. The blank reality suggests by contrast a true conspiracy of silence. His task of investigation is from the outset more than doubled by a surname which vacillates quite differently from that of Shakespeare or Marlowe. *Skelton* and *Shelton*, it has been recently established by Professor Dunbabin in an excellent paper on the topic,<sup>2</sup> "are quite distinct and originated in different parts of England. Shelton was a Norfolk name, Skelton a Cumberland and Yorkshire name." Fortunately a cipher in *Ware the Hawk*<sup>3</sup> fixes the poet's orthography: he used the traditional "k" adopted by most of his contemporaries.<sup>4</sup> Yet confusion arises not only with the Anglian *Shelton* or *Schelton*<sup>5</sup> but with the

<sup>1</sup> A. F. Pollard, *Henry VIII*, p. vii.

<sup>2</sup> *Mod. Lang. Review*, 1917, pp. 137-9. He bases his proof on the simple rule that "surnames derived from names of villages usually originated and remained commonest in the counties where these villages are situated."

<sup>3</sup> Dyce, *Works of Skelton*, i. 163; first deciphered by Henry Bradley in 1896; see *The Academy* for August, p. 83.

<sup>4</sup> E.g. Pico della Mirandola (Dyce, *Amer. ed.*, i. lxxvii-viii), Caxton (qu. Dyce, i. xi-xii) and the Cambridge Univ. Registers (checked by Dyce, i. xiii). Pits has *Sceltomus*; cf. *Cal. Pat. Rolls Ed. IV*, 536, 545. All the earliest editions of his poems have *Skelton*.

<sup>5</sup> Erasmus (Allen, *Eras. Ep.*, i. 239-41), in his letter to Prince Henry published in 1500, used the form *Sheltonum*, but corrected it in 1507 to *Skeltonum*. Cf. the alternatives in *L. and P. Hen. VIII*, i. 438 (1 m. 16): "Nicholas Shelton, or Skelton, of London, mercer"; this is the more noteworthy as a Clement Skelton of Carlisle and a John Shelton of Norfolk appear in the pardon roll (which gave all the known variants of each name) with no *alias*. Our poet's appearance in the list with only a *Skelton* to his credit clinches the matter.

Whittington, a contemporary, however, as the acrostic proves (Dyce, i. xvi-ix), used *Skelton*; so did Lily (*ibid.*, i. xxxviii); and cf. Warton, *Hist. Eng. Poetry*, ii. 443, note n. But these are rare confusions; see index of *L. and P.*, vol. i. for *Schelton* as a variant of *Shelton*. Blomefield too (*Hist. of Norfolk*, iii. 175) has a note on the *Scheltons*, "which Family, tho' they took their Name from this Village (*i.e.* Shelton) were antiently seated at *Stradbrooke* in Suffolk."

even more dissimilar *Scheklton*. The last can be easily dismissed as an obvious early Shackleton; <sup>1</sup> but the others provided material for error in Skelton's own lifetime. Dunbabin is content to ascribe all the blunders to "the fact that the name Shelton was much commoner in the South of England"; an examination of very few documents, however, is enough to prove that more have been caused by inaccuracies taken over without check from later "authorities" like Blomefield and Brie. So a mistake which the haste or prejudice of one researcher may have extracted from an aspirate's overbold curves <sup>2</sup> has acquired the authority of print.<sup>3</sup> A new start is imperative.

The Norfolk historian Blomefield is chiefly responsible for the claim of East Anglia to the poet; and his statements have had unfortunate results. His conjecture that Skelton was "son of William Shelton, and Margaret his Wife, whose Will was proved at Norwich, Nov. 7, 1512" <sup>4</sup> was promptly rejected by Dyce on the not unreasonable plea that it contained no reference to a son John; but misled by the confusion, thus insinuated, with the Sheltons, Dyce misquotes <sup>5</sup> Skelton for Shelton, and so opens the door to a mythical Norfolk family of Skeltons. His own contribution is a single mention of one Johanna Skelton, widow, who received a grant from the throne in 1502.<sup>6</sup> This is shadowy enough; and no Norfolk connection is visible. Then Brie, the German scholar who set out to fill the lacunæ in Dyce's memoir, claimed to have met a number of Skeltons in the Norfolk records.<sup>7</sup> These, on

<sup>1</sup> As Dunbabin (*loc. cit.*) suggests. For the solitary example, see B. A. Thümmel, *Studien über John Skelton* (Leipzig, 1905), pp. 20-30.

<sup>2</sup> Which, however, could not be pleaded by Brie for his errors (see *infra*) in regard to Bibl. Harl. 10, where a stroke through the centre of the "k" or a pronounced top curl renders it unmistakable. His transcriptions are also condemned by Mr. L. J. Lloyd, *Rev. Eng. Studies*, 1929, pp. 302 ff.

<sup>3</sup> E.g. those of Brie and Blomefield: the latter is indicted by Rye (*Cal. of Norwich Deeds, etc.*, pp. ii-iii) for numerous inaccuracies. Not even the Public Record Office is immune: Ralph Shelton, who is correctly indexed in *Mails for Hist. of Hen. VII*, appears as Skelton in the index (though not the text) of *Cal. Inquis. Hen. VII; L. and P.* (1524-30), i. 1235, has an erratum correcting Sir John Skelton of Norfolk to Shelton; while Rye himself records twice, under 8 Ed. IV, a Skelton who is (see *infra*) the Ralph Shelton above mentioned.

<sup>4</sup> Blomefield, *op. cit.*, i. 20.

<sup>5</sup> *Op. cit.*, i. v, n. 2. The District Probate Registrar of Norwich informs me that the spelling, in both index, registered copy, and marginal title, is Shelton, as Blomefield has it.

<sup>6</sup> *Ibid.*, i. xxvi.

<sup>7</sup> Brie, *Englische Studien*, b. xxxvii, pp. 3-4. For the wills, see MS. Harl. 10, pp. 318 (pencilled 322), 177 (101). Blomefield again (iii. 177) gives both correctly.

examination, turn out to be (1) the Sir John Shelton already mentioned as wrongly indexed in vol. iv of *Letters and Papers*, and (2) the testators of two Norfolk wills. Of these, inspection of the originals proved one, which in any case (as Brie admits) mentions no son John, to be quite plainly not *Skelton* but "*Johanna Sheltone de Norwico vidua*"; and the second, Brie's "*Cecilia Schelton*," an equally unequivocal "*Cecilia Shelton de Norwico vidua . . . Thome Shelton gentylman*"; it is even marginated *Sheltone*.

As was foreseen by Dunbabin, then, the Norfolk evidence so far adduced is invalidated by a recent confusion with the Sheltons who flourished in that county. This is confirmed by a glance through the public records of the period. For example, the Inquisitions Calendar of Henry VII<sup>1</sup> indexes a Ralph Skelton of Norfolk who melts into Shelton in the text, and to whom Campbell<sup>2</sup> gives four references, first as plain Ralph Shelton, then as esquire, knight, and finally knight and sheriff of the county. (He died in 1499, leaving three sons, of whom John was heir, being about twenty at his father's death.) Ralph's possession of Shelton manor and Snoring proves him to be the "*Skelton*" mentioned by Rye<sup>3</sup> and father to the Sir John Shelton of Shelton whose name occurs so frequently after 1500, and whose independence of the poet is put beyond all doubt by their separate appearance on the same pardon roll. It is only reasonable to infer that he is likewise the "*Sir John Skelton of Norfolk*" of a 1531 reference<sup>4</sup> and also the "*Johannes Skelton Ar(miger)*" in a list of "*all Lordes, Squires and Gentlemen reseant*" in Norfolk in 1500.<sup>5</sup>

Two more false trails may be exposed here for the convenience of posterity. Rye cites a number of "*Skeltons*" from the First Docquet Book of Norwich Enrolled Deeds. Of these one alone, in the sixteenth century, is genuine. This is a "*Thomas Skelton, of Norwich taylor*";<sup>6</sup> the date, 1578. All things considered, it is as possible that this worthy owed his existence to the imperfect celibacy of our poet as that he represents so ill-established a body as the Norfolk Skeltons. Another modern misprint raised considerable expectations. Among the *Original Papers* of the Norfolk and

<sup>1</sup> i. 654, 1228; ii. 225-6, 632.

<sup>2</sup> *Mails for Hist. Hen. VII*, ii. 135, 193, 224, 309.

<sup>3</sup> *Loc. cit.*

<sup>4</sup> *L. and P.*, v. 166 (12).

<sup>5</sup> *Coxe MS.* 155, f. 365; cited Rye, *op. cit.*

<sup>6</sup> *1st Docquet Book*, f. 230. I owe this information to the courtesy of the Norwich City Librarian, Mr. G. A. Stephen.

Norwich Archæological Society is an account of the Premonstratensian abbey of Langley.<sup>1</sup> This included a register of its inmates in 1482, one of whom was a "John Skelton," sub-prior and cellarer, who almost alone of the inmates possessed no living. But alas for the researcher's triumph! The seven lists (1475-1500) of canons resident which were published by the Abbé Gasquet in his study of the order<sup>2</sup> give this individual's name as either *Schelton(e)* or *Shelton*, never Skelton.

One early reference to a Norfolk Skelton should in fairness be mentioned. In 1479<sup>3</sup> a "yoman" of Downham Market was sued for a debt to a "John Skelton, esq.," who had died intestate leaving his affairs in the hands of the rector of Rounton Holme, co. Norfolk. The patent roll has been checked: it has definitely Skelton and not Shelton. But this solitary example can exercise little weight when the number of errors is taken into account. It may even have been their prototype. The Edward Skelton of a 1523 entry is connected with Norfolk by marriage only; he himself is described as being "of London."<sup>4</sup>

On the other hand, as we have already said, Scheltons and Sheltons are plentiful in Norfolk. One volume of the *Letters and Papers*<sup>5</sup> provides a Sir William Schelton, a Sir John Shelton of Suffolk, and a John Shelton of Norfolk who may be a distinct person or the knight of the same name who appears twice later. Actually, therefore, the evidence of a Norfolk origin for Skelton holds very little water. If the pseudo-Skeltons introduced by Dyce and Brie are removed, it has nothing to recommend it beyond a few coincidences. Fuller can give no better reasons than these:<sup>6</sup> "John Skelton is placed in this county, on a double probability, First, because an ancient family of his name is eminently known long fixed therein. Secondly, because he was benefited at Dis, a market-town in Norfolk." We have shown good reason for believing the "ancient family" to have had no connection with the poet or his name. The second point proves nothing: a rector is no more native of his parish than a bishop of his cathedral town. Dyce, indeed, suggests very tentatively<sup>7</sup> that the word *patria* in

<sup>1</sup> Vol. xxi, pt. iii, pp. 171-234.

<sup>2</sup> *Collectanea Anglo-Premonstratensia* (Camden Soc.), iii. 14 ff.

<sup>3</sup> C.P.R. Ed. IV-Rich. III, 150. The reading has been confirmed by the courtesy of the P.R.O.

<sup>4</sup> *L. and P.*, iii. (ii) 2923.

<sup>5</sup> III. (i), 237-8, 241, 245, 906.

<sup>6</sup> *Worthies* (1840 ed.), ii. 461.

<sup>7</sup> *Op. cit.*, i. v, n. 2 (*sub fin.*).

Skelton's Latin elegy on the Norwich Fire might refer to "his native county." This cannot be dismissed as brusquely as Dunbabin seems to think.<sup>1</sup> But though such a usage is possible, the word—especially in the work of a man familiar with the classics—can prove little more than, say, the fact that Carrow Nunnery (where the immortal owner of Philip Sparrow received her schooling) fell into the hands of Sir John Skelton after the Dissolution.<sup>2</sup> Which leaves us with the rest of England—almost literally; for the name Skelton is everywhere in the records, and other guide we have none. The earliest biographers, Bale and Pits, were interested only in the material ready to hand, and this did not include the small beer of domestic commonplace. A solitary clue remains. Fuller agrees with Wood in deriving Skelton from Cumberland.<sup>3</sup> This might seem conclusive were it not for either worthy's habit of erecting uncouth possibility into graceful dogma. It is true that Cumberland was the source of most genuine owners of the name. It is likewise true that modern scientific criticism can on this point offer its backing to the seventeenth-century tradition.<sup>4</sup> Wordsworth's conviction<sup>5</sup> that Skelton was a "brother Cumbrian" was ignored by the cautious Dyce, but deserves mention because he is "certain of having read somewhere . . . that Skelton was born at Branthwaite Hall, in the County of Cumberland"—only about six miles, he adds, from his own native place. Further, there is an impressive battalion of Cumberland Skeltons in the pages of the P.R.O. publications for the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries.

But Yorkshire may claim no less attention on grounds such as these. It is rich in Skelton place-names.<sup>6</sup> As early as the end of the fourteenth century Chancery records mention a "*Nicholas de*

<sup>1</sup> *Loc. cit.* Polydore Vergil, when describing the triumph of Wolsey in 1516, writes: "Deinde Thomas dux Northfolchiæ in suam patriam se recepit," which is borrowed by Lord Herbert of Cherbury: "Then Thomas Duke of Norfolk craved Leave to go to his Country House" (*Hist.*, bk. xxvii., p. 646, and *Hist.*, p. 53—both qu. Ramsay, introd. to *Magnificence*). And when Wolsey remarked of his biographer Cavendish, that he abandoned "his own country, wife and children . . . only to serve me," he certainly did not refer to an exile abroad (qu. Morley, introd. to *Cavendish's Life*, N.U.L., p. xi). Pits too, in his biography of Whittington (*sub an.* 1530), describes him as "*natione Anglus, patria Lichfeldensis.*"

<sup>2</sup> Blomefield, ii. 865.

<sup>3</sup> *Op. cit.*, i. 346; and *Ath. Ox.*, i. 49. It is, as we have seen, for the sake of convenience that Fuller transfers his biography to Norfolk from Cumberland, which has, he declares, an "undoubted title" to him.

<sup>4</sup> V. Dunbabin, *loc. cit.*

<sup>5</sup> Letter to Dyce; see Grosart, *Prose Works of Wordsworth*, iii. 334.

<sup>6</sup> "There is one in the East Riding, three in the North Riding, and one in the West Riding," *N. and Q.*, 9th S., xi. 429.



Skelton, *sergeant d'armes*," who won immortality by his ejection from "*certainys tenementz en la Citee d'Euerwyke* (York)." <sup>1</sup> Then, the Earl of Northumberland, whose son is addressed as patron by Skelton,<sup>2</sup> was assassinated (April 28, 1489) at his "seat at Cocklodge, near Thirske, in Yorkshire," of which county he was Lord Lieutenant.<sup>3</sup> And Dyce, in another connection, has suggested <sup>4</sup> that the *tetrastichon* of discipular praise "*ad magistrum Rukshaw*" (which follows Skelton's elegy on this subject) may refer to the "William Rowkshaw, priest" a letter of whom is preserved written from "the Gilbertine priory of Watton in the east riding of Yorkshire." The county can also show two landowners, Richard and Walter Skelton, in the reign of Henry VII; in 1524 one Sir Robert was vicar of St. Stephen's, York.<sup>5</sup>

Here again emerges a simple but melancholy fact, too little appreciated by adherents of the northern solution. Long before the Tudor period the Skelton family had penetrated into every corner of the country, south, east, and west. A handful of random instances must suffice to prove this dispersion. An Adam de Skelton was domiciled in Hants as far back as the reign of Edward I.<sup>6</sup> In the fifth year of Edward II we hear of a John de Skelton in London; he is able to appear at Westminster for a Kentish friend in a land dispute.<sup>7</sup> This connection with Kent extended to the lifetime of our poet, a decade before whose death there was buried in Edenbridge cemetery a Skelton of the same name. In 1482 a "boteman" of Gillingham, Thomas Skelton, "surrendered to the Flete prison" for debt.<sup>8</sup> Oxford, both town and university, had its quota. In the fourteenth century William de Skelton was Fellow of Merton and (1339-40) Chancellor; and an Adam de Skelton, of Queen's, was Proctor in 1406.<sup>9</sup> In the 1460's a John Skelton was important enough to be named executor to a Fellow of Oriel, and, a little later, one of the *arbitros, arbitratores necnon amiables compositores* to settle a dispute between an Oxford church-

<sup>1</sup> *Select Cases in Chancery* (Selden Soc.), s.v. Skelton.

<sup>2</sup> Dyce, i. 6:

*Ad dominum properato meum, mea pagina, Percy. . . .*

<sup>3</sup> Percy, qu. Dyce, ii. 89.

<sup>4</sup> Dyce, ii. 92. The letter is in the *Plumpton Correspondence* (Camden Soc.), p. 82.

<sup>5</sup> *Cal. Inquis. Hen. VII*, i. 256, 780; and *L. and P.*, iv. (i), p. 874.

<sup>6</sup> *Cal. Anc. Deeds*, vi. 6008.

<sup>7</sup> *Arch. Cantiana*, xi. 342.

<sup>8</sup> *Ibid.*, xxi. 113; *C.P.R. Ed. IV-Rich. III*, 290.

<sup>9</sup> *Hist. Reg. Univ. of Oxford* (1888 ed.), p. 410.

woman and her spiritual guides. Matilda Skelton was the *alias* of a local light-o'-love who in 1466 was bidden keep ten miles between herself and the students until she had repented of her sins in lawful wedlock. 'The Vicar of St. Egidius', "*Willelmus Skeltone*," can scarcely compensate for her; he is known by virtue of having been bound over to keep the peace.<sup>1</sup>

In early Tudor days, Lincoln had a cathedral treasurer named William who died about 1509, Berkshire a "gentilman" named Barnard, of New Windsor, who in 1506 was pardoned for hunting on the royal preserves, Northants a landowner, Richard and Bedford a maltman of Dunstable, Edward by name, who was in 1519 among the retinue of Sir Richard Wingfield, deputy of Calais. Further west a Richard Skelton was commissioned in 1523-4 to collect the subsidy for Bridgewater, Somerset—perhaps the same Richard who in 1494 had put a Devon mercer in the Fleet over a debt.<sup>2</sup>

Evidence of this kind has in fact led Professor Ramsay<sup>3</sup> to offer a third hypothesis. Surrey is the county honoured on this occasion. Ramsay bases his theory on three entries in the *Household Books* (1481-90)<sup>4</sup> of the duke of Norfolk and the earl of Surrey. According to these, payments were made on October 3 and 19, 1483, to, among others, a John Skelton, "for to bey them leverye gownys" and for a visit to London in the earl's retinue. More important, in 1485 John is found among Reigate's contribution to the earl's militia—and therefore fought against Henry VII at Bosworth! To support this identification there is the usual mass of circumstantial evidence. Skelton was undoubtedly on intimate terms with the Howard family in later life. The *Garland*, written at its castle of Sheriff-Hutton, makes special mention of "the noble Cowntes of Surrey" and her regard for the writer.<sup>5</sup> Surrey himself receives a special compliment in the Flodden poem.<sup>6</sup> *Magnificence*, as Ramsay points out, can be attributed to this loyalty; he might also have mentioned *Why Come Ye Not to Court*; in which Dacres, Roos, and Northumberland are soundly drubbed for general incompetence and the young earl of Surrey alone gets a word of approval.<sup>7</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Salter, *Reg. Cancellarii Oxon.*, 1434-49, ii. 164, 316, 188; i. 4.

<sup>2</sup> *L. and P.*, i. (i), 438 (1 m. 10); i. (ii), g. 3226 (7), ii. (i), 1155; iii. (i), 55, (ii), 1366; iv. (i), 236. For William, cf. *C.P.R. Hen. VII* (1494-1509), 171, 203; for Richard, *ibid.*, 460; for Barnard, *C.P.R. Hen. VII* (1485-94), 480.

<sup>3</sup> *Magnificence* (E.E.T.S.), pp. cxxv-viii.

<sup>4</sup> Ed. Roxburghe Club, London, 1844.

<sup>5</sup> Dyce, ii. 299, 317-18.

<sup>6</sup> *Ll.* 135-42.

<sup>7</sup> *Ll.* 269-88.

## JOHN SKELTON: A GENEALOGICAL STUDY 413

Then the scene of the famous Tunning, Letherhead, is in the county. Skelton was appointed to a living in Norfolk; his patron was created duke of the same county.

Nothing more tangible can be discovered unfortunately. The parish registers of Reigate do not cover the poet's lifetime. But, besides Ramsay's example, a person of the same name was, it appears, assessed in Kingston in 1524-5.<sup>1</sup> In Reigate itself Skeltons are in regular evidence from 1561,<sup>2</sup> on September 3 of which year Robert Skelton's wife "Katren" gave birth to the first of five children, one of whom was christened "Jhon." Robert himself is registered as "ye quenes servant," but in what capacity is not stated.

Once more we have to recall that this proves nothing but the family's endless ramification. A Skelton was even among Warbeck's most intimate councillors.<sup>3</sup> Undoubtedly mobility of service under the king or a great noble was largely responsible for the dissemination. In the Tudor household itself we find a number of Skeltons. One of Henry VII's grooms of the scullery was a James Skelton, who was retained for his successor's coronation.<sup>4</sup> The career of another, Thomas,<sup>5</sup> possibly a relative, well exemplifies the policy of the New Monarchy. First heard of as groom in the palace, "Larder, Boilinghouse and Scaldinghouse"—he had by 1517 so distinguished himself as to procure a corrody in the monastery of Bath. The following year saw him beneficed in Worcestershire, but for some reason he "resigned" in 1519, after only eight months of clerical activity, and is heard of no more. Yet another culinary Skelton, John by name,<sup>6</sup> is recorded as helping to provide the Christmas cheer of 1521—for a full twelve days—in the household of princess Mary, at a salary of 3s. 4d. Outside the kitchen, Ambrose Skelton,<sup>7</sup> after serving as park-keeper (at Tunbridge, Kent) to the duke of Buckingham until that luckless nobleman lost his head in 1521, seems to have been transferred to the royal service. By 1530 he was gentleman-usher—and instrumental in the losing of a carpet and cushion (once Wolsey's) at the 1530 Parliament. He

<sup>1</sup> *V.C. Hist. Surrey*, iii, 294.

<sup>2</sup> For the entries relating to this family I am indebted to Mr. Hooper, of Redhill.

<sup>3</sup> C. L. Kingsford, *Chronicles*, qu. Pollard, *Henry VII*, i, 181.

<sup>4</sup> *L. and P.*, i, (i), pp. 18, 40.

<sup>5</sup> *Ibid.*, i, (i), p. 383; ii, (ii), 3242, 4377; iii, (i), 154.

<sup>6</sup> *Ibid.*, iii, (ii), p. 1406.

<sup>7</sup> *Ibid.*, iii, (i), pp. 499, 508; iv, (iii), p. 2767; v, 119 (50).

then exchanged the King's service for that of his "one and only illegitimate son," the duke of Richmond and Somerset, to recover his good name and receive from the duke lands in Gloucestershire, where he probably ended his days and established a Gloucester branch of the family.

## § 2

So far, then, three points have been established: (1) the Skelton family originated in the North of England; (2) numerous representatives were to be found in the South some time before the Tudor period; and (3) it had no connection whatever with the Shelton family. The claim of Norfolk is almost certainly invalidated by (3); that of Cumberland and Yorkshire by (2); while Surrey's has no more substance than either. To swell the chaos with a fourth suggestion may therefore seem mere wantonness. But the evidence will, I believe, provide its own justification. I have mentioned the importance of royal service in what one is tempted to call the *Skelton diffusion*; but actual examples have been confined to minor domestics of the palace. A study of the Patent Rolls of the fifteenth century, however, reveals some highly significant facts.

On December 16, 1422,<sup>1</sup> one "John (de) Skelton, king's esquire" was confirmed in a grant of 20 marks which had been made him by Henry V, from the customs in the port of Hull. Two years later he was pardoned for his "intermarriage" with the young widow of a royal ward. In 1431, "John Skelton, king's esquire" proved that Henry V "when in foreign parts" had promised him £20 a year for life, and some land in Normandy; Henry VI therefore compensated him with £20 from the revenues of Coventry. Flaws in the patent, however, bring it up repeatedly, in which process we learn that this same John "has 40 marks yearly from the issues of Cumberland" and is also permitted to rent "Hermenthwayt" in that county for himself and his heirs. In 1443 "John Skelton, esquire, son of John Skelton, chivaler" is mentioned as holding certain lands in Cumberland "of the king's grant for life"; and in 1461 "John Skelton, son of John Skelton" received a grant of land in Armathwaite, Cumberland, shortly after a commission to help "array" that county against the Scots.

<sup>1</sup> For the data in this paragraph, see (respectively) *C.P.R. Hen. VI* (1422-29), 16, 198; *ibid.* (1429-36), 190; *ibid.* (1441-46), 170, 324, 327, 191; *C.P.R. Ed. IV* (1461-67), 109, 66.

Then, with the accession of Edward IV, appears *another* John Skelton, esquire.<sup>1</sup> His distinct identity is proved by the nature of the rewards "for his good service to the king and his brothers." On August 8, 1461 (four months after the Armathwaite grant above mentioned) he is granted, for life, the office and fees of "spigurnel of Chancery," followed in October by those of "surveyor of the scrutiny in the port of London and places, ports and creeks adjacent." In the next year he is constable of the royal castle of Hadleigh, Essex, though further entries show that he retained his other offices until the end of 1466, when he drops from sight.

John was not the only Skelton to be found useful by monarchs. Edward Skelton<sup>2</sup> had been serjeant-at-arms to Henry VI at least as early as 1452, when the source of his fee (12*d.* a day) was changed from Nottingham to Norfolk. But the office was no sinecure. In the year following Edward was charged to hold up all the vessels in the Thames for inquiry, and he is repeatedly commissioned for the arrest of malefactors. Edward IV was glad to retain his services (by word of mouth, declares the roll); and he made full use of them, especially with regard to piracy and pilfering from wrecks between Hastings and Yarmouth. His office was again confirmed by Richard III; but despite this, when in 1486, being then "in his decrepet age," he petitioned Henry VII for support the Tudor gave him a pension of 20 marks, which he enjoyed until his death in 1510. The annuity grant describes him, for the first time, as "Edward Skelton, knight."

Two facts are clear. First, the chief Skelton branch, whose seat was Armathwaite Castle, established its hold in Cumberland through assiduous loyalty to the king. Whether the entries concern two or three John Skeltons, is immaterial: the fact remains that a close attendance on the king preceded the final settlement of the Armathwaite Skeltons. The title "esquire" might imply only "a man belonging to the higher order of English gentry, ranking immediately below a knight"; but "king's esquire" must involve some office, such as herald, judge, or serjeant-at-arms.<sup>3</sup> Once

<sup>1</sup> C.P.R. Ed. IV (1461-67), 39, 52, 138, 469, 536, 545. The two last give him as Skelton.

<sup>2</sup> C.P.R. Hen. VI (1452-61), 20, 117, 122, 491; C.P.R. Ed. IV (1461-67), 17; *ibid.* (1467-77), 29, 197, 317-19, 379, 491-3; C.P.R. Ed. IV-Rich. III, 49, 77-8, 145, 414, 439; C.P.R. Hen. VII (1485-94), 101; *Matls. Hen. VII*, i. 314; *L. and P.*, i. (i), 632 (41), (ii), 3107 (21). The "Edmund Skelton, serjeant-at-arms" of C.P.R. Hen. VI (1452-61), 491, is obviously a mistake for Edward.

<sup>3</sup> N.E.D., s.v. "esquire."



landed, the Armathwaite Skeltons, as their records show, remained in Cumberland; but to get their land they seem to have migrated South. In returning, however—and this is the important point—they appear to have left behind several members who preferred the life in and around London. At least, from the middle of the century the number of Skeltons in this area is significant. John the port surveyor and Edward the sergeant apart, we hear of a Thomas Skelton of Middlesex in 1464,<sup>1</sup> a Robert, “late of Carlyle,” who in 1468 owed money to a London goldsmith, and, notably, a second Edward, a “gentilman,” late of Carlisle but now (1497) of Westminster, who was pardoned of various offences in 1470 and again in 1497; perhaps the man who was attainted in 1512. A mercer of the same name appears in 1460 as “late of London”; another in 1523 was living in London with a wife called Joan. A Skelton, finally, is recorded as owning in 1503 a tenement only two doors away from the parish church of St. Margaret’s, Westminster, where the poet found sanctuary and a grave. The reiterated connection with Carlisle cannot be ignored: Armathwaite is less than ten miles distant.

It is surely a legitimate inference from all this, that at least one offshoot of the Armathwaite family flourished in London in the mid-fifteenth century, retaining some connection with its Cumberland home, but at the century’s close forming a distinct “Southron” group, with a strong loyalist tradition at its centre. Its most important members would rank as “gentry,” and through Edward, the royal sergeant, attached itself closely to the capital and the Court.

I wish to avoid unprofitable conjecture. But it cannot, I think, be denied that the circumstances of Edward’s life correlate excellently with all the known facts concerning our poet. A relationship between them, whether paternal or merely cognate, would explain much. It would admit of a (distant) Cumberland origin while explaining Skelton’s familiarity with the life of London and its environs. It would easily account for his position at the Court of Henry VI’s nephew. It would offer a natural explanation of his patronage by the Howards.<sup>2</sup> The reason for his irregular education

<sup>1</sup> *C.P.R. Ed. IV* (1461–67), 316; *ibid.* (1467–77), 73; *ibid.*, 214, and *C.P.R. Hen. VII* (1494–1509), 123, and *L. and P.*, ii, 3383, 3563; *C.P.R. Hen. VI* (1452–61), 625; *L. and P.*, iii, (ii), 2923; *C.P.R. Hen. VII* (1494–1509), 335. For the importance of Armathwaite, cf. *L. and P.* i–iii, *passim*.

<sup>2</sup> *E.g.* Thomas Howard, earl of Surrey, was on the same commission as Edward Skelton, investigating a shipwreck theft off Yarmouth, in 1477; see *C.P.R. Ed. IV–Rich. III*, 49.

# JOHN SKELTON: A GENEALOGICAL STUDY 417

and early leap into prominence would be clear. And it would throw light on his treatment of Garnesche in the *Flying*.

The suggestion has more than once been made that Skelton's insistence, in all his satire, on the accident of birth proves a secret shame at his own credentials.

Dysparage ye myn auncetry ? <sup>1</sup>

he growled at Sir Christopher Garnesche, knight and (like Ambrose Skelton) gentleman-usher to Henry VIII ; but for evidence of that ancestry he quotes, first, the favour of the king who established the *parvenu* in English society, and then his honorary degree at Oxford and his royal tutorship. Again, Sir Christopher is sneered at for an upstart scullion :

Whan ye war yonger of age,  
Ye war a kechyn page,  
A dyshwasher, a dryuyll,  
In the pot your nose dedde sneuyll ;  
Ye fryed and ye broylyd,  
Ye roastyd and ye boylyd,  
Ye roastyd, lyke a fonne,  
A gose with the fete vponne ;  
Ye slvfferd vp sowse  
In my lady Brewysa howse.  
Wherto xulde I wryght  
Of soche a gresy knyght ? <sup>2</sup>

the while belowstairs, perhaps even listening to the match behind closed doors, was more than one kitchenman bearing the poet's name. But this was beyond doubt accidental. It would have been too stupidly rash to tax Garnesche with a scullery taint which was really Skelton's own—the visible evidence for which was perhaps even ready to hand in the palace. A gentleman-usher (*teste* Wolsey's Cavendish) would be familiar with the personnel of his establishment down to the humblest turnspit.

No ; Skelton's forthright tongue is not edged with a discomfort over his own birth, nor, as certainly, with the pride of lineage. His confidence is based on quite other, religio-artistic, grounds. As he upholds the prince, God-appointed, against the crazy individualism of a Wolsey, and the nobility against the "comoners," whose quality "depended of their excellence," <sup>3</sup> so his own position is defensible not because of blood, but by the divine right of the poet, God-

<sup>1</sup> *Against Garn.*, iv. 63.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, iii. 24 ff.

<sup>3</sup> *Upon the Death of the Earl of Northumberland*, l. 69 :

Your worshyp depended of his excellence.

inspired. Yet, I suggest, he had a claim to "family." The sergeant-at-arms ranked with a knight; his duties brought him into contact with the highest in the land, and in particular with his sovereign.<sup>1</sup> And if this was the poet's playground, we cannot accuse him of wasting his experience.

One fragment of evidence typifies very exactly the exasperating nature of our search. The record of the administration of Skelton's estate in the Commissary Court of Westminster<sup>2</sup> tells us that a Magister William Mott, curate of St. Margaret's, sought the administration of his belongings. Six years later, Sir William Skelton, curate of Hoo, in Kent, witnessed the will of John Mott, of Hoo, in the same county.<sup>3</sup> John Skelton—William Mott, curate: William Skelton, curate—John Mott. One is tempted to comment merely, *Hoo!* Thynne, the Chaucer critic's remark<sup>4</sup> should be mentioned here, perhaps. He declares that his father William "furthered Skelton to publishe his 'Collen Cloute' against the Cardinall, the most parte of whiche Booke was compiled in my fathers howse at Erithe in Kent." But it is more natural to assume that the pair met at the Court of Henry VIII, with whom Thynne was, according to his son, "in great fauore," than to conclude that Skelton was a man of Kent.

### § 3

From out the preceding welter one may rescue a few conclusions. The Skelton family, quite distinct from the Norfolk Sheltons, originated in the North, in Cumberland and Yorkshire. By the fifteenth century members were scattered over the whole island, and ranged from sheriffs and gentlemen, vicars and maltmen to university bigwigs, cooks, whores, and pirates.<sup>5</sup> Regarding Skelton himself, facts are non-existent and tradition is almost useless, depending as it does upon accident, whim, or actual error. Circumstantial data are plentiful but confusing, merely. If his anti-Scot bias, name, and patron link him with the North, his benefice, certain records, and another patron point to Norfolk; Surrey makes

<sup>1</sup> *N.E.D.*, s.v. "sergeant."

<sup>2</sup> Recorded at Somerset House (6 Bracy), November 16, 1529. In Tunstall's register, now in St. Paul's, I find, under December 18, 1529, "*Williamus Mott*" admitted vicar "*Sancte Brigide in fletestrete.*"

<sup>3</sup> *Arch. Cant.*, xxii. 307.

<sup>4</sup> *Animadversions*, ed. Kingsley (E.E.T.S.), p. 7.

<sup>5</sup> *L. and P.*, ii. (i), 1429, mentions a William Skelton among a band of pirates Surrey is asked to disperse in 1516.

a good runner-up, but Yorkshire and Kent have hitherto unrecognized claims. Family connections *may* exist with the Court widow Joan, with John of Reigate, William of Hoo, and the householder of St. Margaret's.

Most satisfactory, however, from all viewpoints, is the king's "trwe liege man" Edward Skelton. If this be accepted, Skelton was of gentle but not exalted birth; he was probably brought up in or near London; and Edward's activities would make him familiar with the ins and outs of the Court. There, perhaps, he was first brought to the notice of the Earl of Surrey; and there he must have acquired the *sans gêne* which enabled him to abuse the French ambassador as early as 1489.

The suggestion may also restore a figure which has been dismissed by all the critics who came after Dyce. This, Dyce's last candidate for the part of Skelton as a young man, was rejected by them on the ground that he was the Sir John Skelton we have proved mythical.<sup>1</sup> The case deserves re-examination.

On December 9, 1472, and February 23 following, the sum of 40s. was paid to "Johannus Skelton," an under-clerk (*subclericus*) in the Receipt of the Exchequer. His name is not among the list of admissions to this post; he was therefore an irregular, introduced perhaps by royal or noble favour. The end of Edward III's reign saw an increase in the number of clerks of this department, to cope with the almost unmanageable proportions of the work, which now covered most of the royal revenues. Before the Tudor reforms, its organization had almost completely broken down; and the son of a loyal and needy retainer (such as Edward Skelton might well have been) who showed a facility for the clerklly accomplishment of engrossing accounts, could easily have found a temporary salve for his purse in this work.

The weakest point in the argument is chronological. No reliable date exists for Skelton's birth. Cole's statement<sup>2</sup> that "'tis probable he might be . . . 68 or 69 years old," is the earliest hazard I have seen; and depends upon the Scheklton reference which Thümmel has proved false. The Rev. Alexander Dyce was doubtless influenced as much by biblical tradition as by hellenic symmetry

<sup>1</sup> Dyce, i. lii, cf. Brie, pp. 4-5, with a false reference to *L. and P.* which is correctly given by Lee to support the same conclusion (*D.N.B.*, s.v. "Skelton").

<sup>2</sup> *Collections*: Add. MSS. 5880, p. 199; qu. Dyce, i. vi, n. 3. Ritson (*Bibl. Poet.*, p. 102), obviously following Cole, says he died "being aged, by conjecture, about 68."

when he pushed the date back to (?) 1460.<sup>1</sup> Yet there is nothing to show that 1450 is an impossible date. His enemy Barclay seems to have reached the age of seventy-five; and the vigour of a bearded contemporary of our own gives the lie to theories of decrepitude at that age. Even so, if we allow the now sanctified (?) 1460 to pass, Jack Skelton, at an age when the mother of Henry VII brought him into the light, was surely capable of pushing counters over the *scaccarium*, or at least recording the result of that mystic process in the "large Gothic hand" he is said<sup>2</sup> to have used. Still more, of receiving the sum of xls. wherewith to enjoy the bustle of Westminster, perhaps without putting inky hand to quill. At that, in the absence of further evidence, we must leave the matter.

<sup>1</sup> Dyce, i. v.

<sup>2</sup> By Dr. James, cited Lloyd, *loc. cit.* The supposed Skelton holographs are numerous (cf. e.g. *L. and P.*, ii. (ii), p. 1518), but surely Brie's suggestion (see Lloyd, *supra*) is more plausible than most. The corrections to the "Mistress Anne" poem he discovered are almost conclusive, and the hand here is apparently very far from a "large Gothic."

## SHAKESPEARE, CHAUCER, AND HARSNETT

By F. E. BUDD

IN a lecture on "Shakespeare's Significances" (1928)<sup>1</sup> Mr. Edmund Blunden has demonstrated that after two centuries of "critical observations" and editorial notes there is still scope for detailed illustration of the text of *Lear*. The effect of his criticism is two-fold: it adds to the already abundant intellectual and emotional riches of the play and it allows us glimpses of Shakespeare's mental processes. The purpose of the present article is to suggest that yet another sentence from one of the crucial scenes with which Mr. Blunden is concerned may benefit from fresh consideration. It is the first remark made by Edgar, disguised as Tom of Bedlam, when Lear, Kent, the Fool, and himself have been given shelter by Gloucester from the raging of the storm:

*Frazeretto* calms me, and tells me *Nero* is an Angler in the Lake of Darknesse. (III. vi. 6-7).

John Upton, in his *Critical Observations on Shakespeare* (1746), appears to have been the first to explain the latter part of this remark as a borrowing from Rabelais. Briefly, his argument is that Shakespeare had found in Rabelais statements to the effect that Nero was a fiddler in hell and Trajan an angler. Following Rabelais, Shakespeare had written "Trajan is an angler"—a reading which, Upton suggests, should be restored—"but the players and editors, not willing that so good a prince as Trajan should have such a vile employment, substituted *Nero* in his room, without any sense or allusion at all" (p. 226). Subsequent commentators and editors, by retaining "*Nero*," have continued to show the same regard for Trajan's reputation as those responsible for the Quarto and Folio texts; and from the eighteenth century onwards Nero's occupation as an angler has been attributed to Shakespeare's "confusedly recalling Rabelais's original and uncorroborated discovery that

<sup>1</sup> Shakespeare Association, Pamphlet No. 14.



Trajan was in hell as an angler for frogs, while Nero was there as a fiddler."<sup>1</sup>

The relevant statements from Rabelais occur in *Pantagruel*, chap. xxx, where Epistemon, restored to life through the ministrations of Panurge, gives an account of the classical and mediæval figures whom he has met in hell. The amiable devils do not treat them so badly as one might expect, he remarks, "mais leur estat est changé en estrange façon." Those who had been "gros Seigneurs" in this world have, in hell, to earn a wretched living by unseemly means. Accordingly, "Trajan estoit pescheur de grenouilles" and "Neron estoit vielleux." (Incidentally, the two are not mentioned consecutively, and, on purely typographical considerations, confusion would not appear to be easy.) Rabelais, therefore, makes Nero pursue as a profession in hell the hobby which had degraded him in life. For Rabelais he was exclusively a fiddler, as apparently he has been for Shakespeare's editors.<sup>2</sup>

If it could be shown that Nero had also been an angler, then, *pace* Upton, Edgar's remark would not be "without any sense or allusion at all" and editors would hesitate before repeating the explanation that it was due to a misreading of Rabelais. If, furthermore, the choice of "the Lake of Darknesse" as the place for Nero's angling and his association with Fraterretto could be otherwise explained, one would wonder why Rabelais had ever been invoked as Shakespeare's source. These two things I shall attempt to do in sections I and III of the following notes, while I hope in II to demonstrate a previously unsuspected debt of Shakespeare to Chaucer.<sup>3</sup>

## I

Two aspects of Nero's behaviour which most of his biographers agree in stressing are his cruelty and his riotous extravagance. Suetonius seems to have been the first to illustrate this extravagance by reference to the costly tackle with which Nero angled :

piscatus est rete aurato et purpura coccoque funibus nexis,<sup>4</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Sir Sidney Lee, *The French Renaissance in England*, 1910, p. 163.

<sup>2</sup> "There seems no historic ground for describing Nero as an angler" (Lee, in *The Caxton Shakespeare*, xvii., *King Lear*, p. 109).

<sup>3</sup> Mr. Huntington Brown, in his *Rabelais in English Literature*, 1933, does not include Edgar's remark in his list of parallels between Shakespeare and Rabelais (pp. 210-5), and even those parallels that he does give he fails to find "highly significant" of any direct relationship.

<sup>4</sup> *Duodecim Cæsares*, lib. VI, Nero, cap. 30 (ed. M. Ihm, Lipsiæ, 1908, p. 240).

—a statement which Philemon Holland renders thus :

Hee fished with a golden net (drawen and knit) with cords twisted of purple and crimsen silke in graine.<sup>1</sup>

Eutropius<sup>2</sup> echoes Suetonius, as may be seen from Nicolas Haward's translation :

He fyshed wyth golden nettes, the ropes of which, wher with they were drawn fourth of the water, were of Purple silke.<sup>3</sup>

So also do Orosius,<sup>4</sup> Vincent of Beauvais,<sup>5</sup> Boccaccio,<sup>6</sup> and Higden,<sup>7</sup> whose Latin Trevisa thus translates :

He fisched wiþ nettes of gold, þe nettes were i-drawe wiþ [ropis of] reed silk.<sup>8</sup>

In the account of Nero in *The Monkes Tale* Chaucer, who mentions Suetonius as his general source and does in fact follow him on this point, says :

Nettes of gold-thred hadde he gret plentee  
To fisse in Tybre, whan him liste pleye (B. 3665-6).

Lydgate, in *The Fall of Princes*, states that Nero

With nettis of gold fisshed in his ryueeris ;<sup>9</sup>

while, in *The Mirour for Magistrates* (1587), Higgins makes Nero boast :

With golden nets in ryot I would fishe,  
And purple lines to drawe my nets I had.<sup>10</sup>

Grafton's *Chronicle* (1569) has the same reference :

for he vsed to fishe with Nettes made of Golde, which shoulde be drawne with Cordes of Purple silke.<sup>11</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Suetonius, *History of Twelve Cæsars*, translated into English by Philemon Holland, anno 1606, ed. C. Whibley, 1899, ii. 124.

<sup>2</sup> "Retibus aureis piscaretur, quæ blattinis funibus extrahebat," *Breviarium ab urbe condita*, lib. VII, cap. 14 (ed. F. Ruehl, Lipsiæ, 1887, p. 49).

<sup>3</sup> *A brieve Chronicle . . . of the City of Rome . . . by Eutropius . . . Englished by Nicolas Haward . . . 1564*, fol. 75 verso-76 recto.

<sup>4</sup> "Retibus aureis piscaretur, quæ purpureis funibus extrahebantur," *Historiæ adversum Paganos*, lib. VII, cap. 7 (ed. C. Zangemeister, Lipsiæ, 1889, p. 246).

<sup>5</sup> "Piscatus est reti aurato, purpura & cocco funibus nexis," *Speculum historiale*, lib. IX, cap. 7 (Venetia, 1494, fol. 102 recto, col. b).

<sup>6</sup> "Aureo rethi, purpureo tracto fune, piscari solitus erat," *De Casibus Virorum Illustrium*, lib. VII, cap. 4 (Augustæ Vindelicorum, 1544, p. 191).

<sup>7</sup> "Retibus aureis piscabatur, quæ funibus purpureis extrahebantur," *Polychronicon Ranulphi Higden*, ed. J. R. Lumby, 1872, iv. 394.

<sup>8</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 395.

<sup>9</sup> Bk. VII, l. 674 (ed. H. Bergen, E.E.T.S., 1924, Pt. III, p. 793).

<sup>10</sup> Ed. J. Haslewood, 1815, i. 297.

<sup>11</sup> Ed. H. Ellis, 1809, i. 61.

Finally, there is Pedro Mexia,<sup>1</sup> who, as translated by Wm. Traheron, says :

When he went a fishing (whereunto he was extremely affected) and for his pleasure went to the sea and riuers, he commaunded the nets to be made of gold threed, and the ropes of most excellent fine silke.<sup>2</sup>

## II

Shakespeare's allusion to Nero as a fisherman is obviously justified by the foregoing passages, but to determine from which, if any, of them he borrowed it is necessary to consider his four references to Nero elsewhere. Those from *King Henry the Sixth*, Parts I and III,<sup>3</sup> which respectively cite Nero as the emperor who fiddled while Rome was burning and as a type of cruelty, are of too general a nature to be individually significant. The others, however, are in a different category. They both bear on Nero's murder of his mother Agrippina, perhaps the most arresting of his many cruelties. The first occurs in *King John*, when the Bastard addresses the "ingrate Reuolts" as

You bloody Nero's, ripping vp the wombe  
Of your deere Mother-England (v. ii. 152-3).

The second is spoken by Hamlet when on his way to upbraid his mother :

Oh Heart, loose not thy Nature ; let not euer  
The Soule of Nero, enter this firme bosome :  
Let me be cruell, not vnnaturall,  
I will speake Daggers to her, but vse none (III. ii. 407-410).

<sup>1</sup> *Historia imperial y Cesarea* . . . , Sevilla, 1547, fol. 47 verso, col. b.

<sup>2</sup> *The Historie of all the Romane Emperors*, . . . First collected in Spanish by Pedro Mexia . . . and now englished by W.T., 1604, p. 96.

<sup>3</sup> In *The First Part of King Henry the Sixth*, I. iv. 95-6, Talbot, answering the dying Salisbury's unspoken command to avenge him on the French, exclaims :

Plantaginet I will ; and like thee, [Nero,]  
Play on the Lute, beholding the Townes burne.

In *The Third Part*, III. i. 39-40, the fugitive King Henry reflects on the power of Margaret's pleading to achieve the impossible :

The Tyger will be milde, whiles she doth mourne ;  
And Nero will be tainted with remorse.

(Quotations from Shakespeare, here and elsewhere, are from the First Folio. In Talbot's speech above I have, however, followed Malone and most modern editors in reading "Nero" after F1 "like thee." The allusion is clearly to Nero, and the deficiency in the line is more naturally remedied by the simple addition of his name than by the rewording of the later folios : "Nero-like will" (F2), "Nero-like, will" (F3 F4)).

From what source did Shakespeare learn of Nero's murder of his mother by his own hands and of his unnatural "ripping vp" of her womb?

It was not from any of the classical writers who mention Nero's angling. Suetonius,<sup>1</sup> as translated by Holland, says that Nero

caused . . . his mother aforesaid, to be muredred: pretending, as if by voluntary death she had avoided the odious crime thus detected [a plot against Nero's own life, fabricated by himself], and so made her selfe away.<sup>2</sup>

Eutropius,<sup>3</sup> with whom Orosius<sup>4</sup> agrees, enumerates without comment Nero's crimes against his family:

And when he had slaine hys owne brother, his wife, and his mother, he set the citye of Rome on fire.<sup>5</sup>

Other classical writers speak of the murder of Agrippina, but not of Nero's fishing. Of these Eusebius<sup>6</sup> is as brief as Eutropius. Tacitus (translated 1598),<sup>7</sup> Dio Cassius,<sup>8</sup> and the author of the pseudo-Senecan tragedy *Octavia* (translated [1566])<sup>9</sup> describe how Agrippina was murdered in her villa by Nero's soldiers and, in the moment of her death, thrust forward her womb, asking that the fatal blow might be struck in the place that had borne Nero. From a distortion of their story the version as used by Shakespeare may have arisen, but he certainly did not derive it directly from them. Among later writers Mexia<sup>10</sup> follows Tacitus; Vincent of Beauvais,<sup>11</sup> Boccaccio,<sup>12</sup> and Grafton merely remark that Nero "commaunded her to be put to death";<sup>13</sup> and Higgins makes Nero say nothing more definite than

Still out the sword to slay all sortes I drewe,  
My mother could not scape amongst them free.<sup>14</sup>

<sup>1</sup> *Op. cit.*, cap. 34 (p. 244).

<sup>2</sup> *Op. cit.*, ii. 130.

<sup>3</sup> *Loc. cit.*

<sup>4</sup> *Loc. cit.*

<sup>5</sup> Nicolas Haward, *op. cit.*, fol. 76 recto.

<sup>6</sup> *Historia Ecclesiastica*, lib. II, cap. 25.

<sup>7</sup> *Annales*, lib. XIV, cap. 8. See also *The Annales of Cornelius Tacitus*, by Richard Grenewey (1598), p. 202.

<sup>8</sup> *Historiae Romanae*, lib. LXI, cap. 13.

<sup>9</sup> I. 366-76. For Thomas Nuce's translation, see *Seneca his Tenne Tragedies*, 1581, ed. T. S. Eliot, 1927, ii. 162.

<sup>10</sup> *Op. cit.*, fol. 43 verso, col. a; Traheron, *op. cit.*, p. 83.

<sup>11</sup> *Op. cit.*, lib. IX, cap. 8, fol. 102 recto, col. b.

<sup>12</sup> *Op. cit.*, p. 192.

<sup>13</sup> Grafton, *loc. cit.*

<sup>14</sup> *Op. cit.*, i. 298.

An allusion in *The Troublesome Raigne of King John*, where Philip Fauconbridge is threateningly demanding to know from his mother his father's name, can be dismissed on the grounds that in itself it is not sufficiently explanatory :

And here by heuens eternall lampes I sweare,  
As cursed *Nero* with his mother did,  
So I with you, if you resolute me not (Pt. I, i. 369-71).

This play, moreover, contains no mention of Nero's fishing.

Higden and Lydgate, both of whom refer to the fishing, approach nearer to the version of Agrippina's murder that Shakespeare has in mind than any of the authors previously cited. Higden, as translated by Trevisa, says :

Also he lete kerue his owne moder wombe, for he wolde see þe place þat he was conceyved ynne ;<sup>1</sup>

and Lydgate remarks :

He made hir wombe be korue upon a day  
To seen the place nyne monethes wher he lay.<sup>2</sup>

But, apart from the point that in each of these instances Nero causes the deed to be done but does not do it himself, the fact that Shakespeare elsewhere shows no knowledge of the *Polychronicon* or *The Fall of Princes* makes any indebtedness here highly improbable.

There remains only Chaucer, from whose *Monkes Tale* may be quoted all the lines relevant to this discussion :

Nettes of gold-thred hadde he gret plentee  
To fische in Tybre, whan him liste pleye.  
His lustes were al lawe in his decree,  
For fortune as his freend him wolde obeye.

He Rome brende for his delicacye ;  
The senatours he slow up-on a day,  
To here how men wolde wepe and crye ;  
And slow his brother, and by his sister lay.  
His moder made he in pitous array ;  
For he hir wombe slitte, to biholde  
Wher he conceyved was ; so weilaway !  
That he so litel of his moder tolde ! (B. 3665-76).

It is significant that in Chaucer alone is Nero's outrage on his mother narrated immediately after the mention of his fishing.

<sup>1</sup> *Loc. cit.* Higden's Latin is : " Aluum quoque matris suæ fecit incidi, ut locum conceptionis videret " (*loc. cit.*).

<sup>2</sup> *Op. cit.*, bk. VII, ll. 731-2.

Moreover, except for Shakespeare, he alone makes Nero commit this particular atrocity with his own hands.<sup>1</sup> Another highly significant fact is that, in these twelve consecutive lines of Chaucer, the matter of all five of Shakespeare's allusions to Nero is precisely and conveniently presented. In view, therefore, of the results of this process of elimination and of the positive evidence of the passage just quoted,<sup>2</sup> I submit that Shakespeare's allusions to Nero are direct reminiscences of Chaucer's *Monkes Tale*.

By way of postscript a further similarity between *The Monkes Tale* and *Lear* may be indicated. When the Host, in his "mery wordes . . . to the Monk," is lamenting the violent assertiveness of his wife, he represents her as being bitterly reproachful of his cowardice in not revenging every supposed affront to her :

"Allas !" she seith, "that ever I was shape  
To wedde a milksop or a coward ape,  
That wol be overlad with every wight !  
Thou darst nat stonden by thy wyves right !" (B. 3099-3102).

Such is her contempt for him that she cries :

"I wol have thy knyf,  
And thou shalt have my distaf and go spinne !" (B. 3096-7).

This might well be used to illustrate *Lear*, iv. ii, where Goneril, whose attitude towards the supposedly "Milke-Liuer'd" Albany is exactly that of the Host's wife towards her husband, comments to Edmund on

the Cowish terror of his spirit  
That dares not vndertake : Hee'l not feele wrongs  
Which tye him to an answer (12-14),

and proceeds to say :

I must change arms<sup>3</sup> at home, and giue the Distaffe  
Into my Husbands hands (17-18).

<sup>1</sup> In this respect Chaucer differs from his immediate sources for the last four lines and for the stanza which follows, namely Boethius's *De Consolatione Philosophiae*, lib. II, metre vi, which Chaucer himself translated, and *Le Roman de la Rose*, ll. 6194-6206, a passage not included in the English *Romaunt of the Rose*.

<sup>2</sup> Negative evidence could be almost indefinitely extended. For instance, Shakespeare could not have found his matter in the accounts of Nero in Gower (*Confessio Amantis*, bk. VI, ll. 1151-1227) and Holinshed (*Chronicles*, 1586 : "The Conquest of Ireland," chap. I, vi), or in the many references to Nero in Pliny's *Natural History* (translated by Holland, 1601) ; and it is perhaps worth noting that, among his contemporaries, Spenser has but one bare mention of Nero's name, while Lyly, Sidney, Lodge, and Greene, prodigal though they are in the use of classical names, seem never to refer to him.

<sup>3</sup> I follow Shakespeare's editors in preferring the reading of the Quarto, "arms," to that of the Folio, "names."



## III

It has long been recognized that in *Lear* Shakespeare was indebted for the names of the fiends, including Fraterretto, to Samuel Harsnett's *A Declaration of egregious Popish Impostures* (1603). The explanation of Shakespeare's reason for choosing to combine a reference to Nero from Chaucer's *Monkes Tale* with a reference to Fraterretto from Harsnett's contemporary pamphlet must, like all speculation on mental processes, be necessarily incomplete. It is, nevertheless, incontrovertible that at one moment his mind is with Harsnett and one of his fiends and at the very next moment it is with Nero :

*Fraterretto* calis me, and tells me *Nero* is an Angler in the Lake of Darknesse.

How was this mental transition effected ? To answer this question I will only reproduce the material that must at some time have been in Shakespeare's mind.

Edgar's "*Fraterretto* calis me" is Shakespeare's first use of this particular fiend's name. On turning to Harsnett we find that *his* first mention of Fraterretto occurs where he is relating how Sara Williams was at times possessed of all the devils of hell :

*Fraterretto*, *Fliberdigibbet*, *Hoberdidance*, *Tocobatto* were foure deuils of the round, or Morrice, whom *Sara* in her fits, tuned together, in measure and sweet cadence. And least you should conceiue, that the deuils had no musicke in hell, especially that they would goe a maying without theyr musicke, the Fidler comes in with his Taber, & Pipe, and a whole Morice after him, with motly visards for theyr better grace (p. 49).

"*Fraterretto*" is thus immediately associated with "the Fidler." To Shakespeare "the Fidler" suggests Nero. But this is a mad scene, and Edgar's pseudo-madness requires, here as elsewhere, a sally that will be surprising as well as true. Shakespeare secures this, not by inventing an occupation for Nero, but by employing the unusual "angler" reference already present in his mind from his reading of Chaucer. The fact that the fiend Fraterretto was Edgar's informer would obviously necessitate the locating of Nero in hell, whereupon "the Lake of Darknesse" would immediately suggest itself as the one suitable place for his angling. And Harsnett may well have confirmed Shakespeare's choice by his frequent mention of Styx and Stygian ; for example, shortly before the passage quoted he has the words :

our *stygian* Impostors goe farre beyond that *stygian* lake (p. 45).

In conclusion I may say that I have found nothing that, by opening up other possibilities, would discredit the evidence that I have produced for (I) the correctness of Shakespeare's allusion to Nero as an angler, (II) his indebtedness for this and other references to Chaucer, and (III) a reasonable explanation of the association in one sentence of Fraterretto and Nero as "an Angler in the Lake of Darknesse." At the least, Shakespeare can be freed from the charge of having misread Rabelais.

## MILTON'S REPLY TO LORD DIGBY

BY GEORGE W. WHITING

ONE paragraph of the introduction to his edition of Milton's *Of Reformation Touching Church-Discipline in England* Mr. W. T. Hale devotes to proof of the statement that Milton "had some acquaintance with the controversial literature of his day."<sup>1</sup> Mr. Hale records Milton's allusions to or quotations from Sancta Clara's *Apologia Episcoporum seu Sacri Magistratus*, Bishop Hall's *Episcopacie by Divine Right*, Laud's *Relatio contra Fisher*, Sandys' *A Relation of the State of Religion*, and Malvezzi's *Discorsi sopra il libro primo degli Annali di Cornelio Tacito*. He then says that in "his answers to the objections brought against the Presbyterian discipline" Milton "it seems . . . had before him, at least, Morley's *A Modest Advertisement*, the *Speeches of Sr. Benjamin Rudger* . . ., *The Third Speech of Lord George Digby* . . ., and Lord Falkland's *Speech . . . Concerning Episcopacy* . . ."<sup>2</sup> Mr. Hale refers to Lord Digby's *Speech* in a note on the text (p. 39, l. 8) "that no forme of Church government is agreeable to Monarchy, but that of Bishops." With regard to this statement, which stands near the opening of Book II, the gist of the quotation from Digby's *Speech* (quoted on p. 139) is that monarchy cannot be safe without bishops. In Mr. Hale's notes there are four other brief references to Digby's *Speech*;<sup>3</sup> in three of these notes references are made to other sources. The casual

<sup>1</sup> Yale Studies in English, LIV (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1916), p. lviii.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, p. lviii. In his notes (pp. 180, 186) Mr. Hale cites "Robert Morley, *A Modest Advertisement*" with regard to the reform of ecclesiastical abuses. Morley's first name was not Robert but George. His *A Modest Advertisement Concerning The present Controversie about Church-Government; Wherein the maine Grounds of that Booke, intituled The Unlawfulness and Danger of Limited Prelacie. Are calmly examined*. London, Printed for Robert Bostock, Anno 1641, was published in May (*Thomason Tracts*, I, 13), perhaps too late for Milton to have used it in *Of Reformation*.

<sup>3</sup> *Op. cit.*, pp. 157, 184, 186, 187.

student may conclude that Mr. Hale has fully recorded the relation between Milton's *Of Reformation* and Digby's *Speech*.

The truth is that Mr. Hale completely overlooked or ignored the fact that the refutation of *Of Reformation* is directed mainly at Digby's *Speech*, the points of which Milton follows in order and the phrases of which he sometimes quotes. Besides, Mr. Hale failed to note the date of Digby's *Speech* and the probable bearing of this on the date of composition of Milton's first pamphlet.<sup>1</sup> The title is *The Third Speech Of The Lord George Digby, To the House of Commons, Concerning Bishops, and the Citie Petition, the 9th. of Febr.* 1640. Printed for Tho : Walkley. 1640. In Thomason this speech is entered under February 8.<sup>2</sup> As we shall see, Digby's sarcastic tone in dealing with the London Petition and his unpopular arguments were well calculated to stir indignation both within and without the Commons. In his *Apologie*, Digby bears witness to his immediate loss of favour :

And whosoever remembreth the passages of that time, must call to mind, that the first declination I suffer'd from the interest I seem'd to have, was in the businesse of the Church : in which, having had frequent consultations with the chieftest agents for a reformation, and finding no three men to agree upon what they would have in the place of that they all resolv'd to remove, I agreed not with the prevailing sense, having not hardnesse enough to incline to a mutation, which would evidently have so great an influence upon the peace, prosperity, and interest of the whole Kingdome. And thus, from the first debate of Episcopacy, upon the London Petition, all men observ'd the date of my unmerited favour began to expire.<sup>3</sup>

In a reply to this *Apologie* there is proof of the unpopularity of Digby's *Speech*. The author of this *Answer* blames Digby for publishing his *Speech* on Episcopacy, calls upon him to reflect upon

<sup>1</sup> Mr. Hale does not include Digby's *Speech* in his bibliography. Apparently he read it in Rushworth (see his notes, pp. 186, 187) ; see *Historical Collections*. . . . By John Rushworth, iv. (London, 1721), pp. 170-174. In the margin of p. 170 Rushworth gives the date of the *Speech*.

<sup>2</sup> I, 7. It forms a pamphlet of nineteen pages. In this paper quotations are from the first edition in the Huntington Library. The *Speech* is included in *Speeches and Passages Of This Great and Happy Parliament* : From the third of November, 1640, to this instant June, 1641. Collected into One Volume, and according to the most perfect Originalls, exactly published. London, Printed for William Cooke, and are to be sold at his shop, at Furnifalls-Inne-gate, in Holbourne, 1641, pp. 65-75. This collection includes the speeches of the Lord Falkland and of Nathaniel Fiennes, whose speeches were also published on February 8, on the same date as Digby's.

<sup>3</sup> *The Lord George Digbie's Apologie For Himselfe, Published the fourth of January, Anno Dom. 1642.* Printed at Oxford, 1642, p. 3.

the censure of at least 15,000 good women of London when with so keen a knife he dissected the Petition of their husbands, and would have him "imagine what a report such a clamor raysed upon you in the City, would have, and I assure you had in the Country: . . ."<sup>1</sup> Doubtless the notoriety of Digby's *Speech* helps to explain why Milton honoured Digby with a categorical reply. As we shall see, the following statement by Milton refers unmistakably to this *Speech*: "Here I might have ended, but that some Objections, which I have heard commonly flying about, presse mee to the endeavour of an answer."<sup>2</sup>

Beginning with the assertion that he is to speak on a "tender subject" and that "some within these walls are engaged with earnestnesse in contrary opinions to mine," Digby begs the patience of the House. "There is," he declares, "no man within these walls, more sensible of the heavy grievance of Church government, then my selfe; nor whose affections are keener to the clipping of those wings of the Prelates, whereby they have mounted to such insolencies, nor whose zeale is more ardent to the searing them, as that they may never spring again" (p. 6). He freely condemns the notorious faults of Episcopacy: they have afflicted men of tender conscience; they have introduced innovations, with fresh introductions to Popery; in their pride they have trampled in the dirt men of meek and humble spirit; by their oath they have galled men faithfully addicted to the Crown; they have set forth books, sermons, and canons destructive of the property and the liberty of the subject. In fact, when he considers the outrageous insolencies and abominable cruelties of the bishops, Digby declares he is ready with the loudest of the 15,000 to cry out "down with them, down with them, even to the ground." But as a member, a "most unworthy and inconsiderable" member of this great and wise assembly, he pleads for dispassionate and temperate action; he would divest himself and others "of all those disturbances of Judgement which arise ever from great Provocations, . . ."

Partly from this point of view Digby attacks the London

<sup>1</sup> *An Answer To The Lord George Digbys Apology for Himself*; Published Jan. 4. Anno Dom. 1642. Put into the great Court of Equity, Otherwise called The Court of Conscience, upon the 28th of the same Moneth, By Theophilus Philinax Gerusiphilus Philalethes Decius . . . London, Printed for A. R. 1642, pp. 6-7.

<sup>2</sup> *The Works of John Milton*, iii., Part I (New York: Columbia University Press, 1931), pp. 65-66. In this paper all references to *Of Reformation* are to this edition.

Petition, which in its nature, in the manner of its delivery in the present conjuncture of affairs, both ecclesiastical and civil, he considers "a thing of the highest consequence that any age hath presented to a Parliament; . . ." He professes to look upon it with terror, "as upon a Commet a blazing starre, raised and kindled out of the stench, out of the poysonous exhalation of a corrupted Hierarchy: . . ." He declares that he has not flattered the House, that he could not have flattered the King if fortune had placed him near the King, and that he does not now intend to flatter a multitude. He declares that the Petition abounds in things contemptible, irrational, and presumptuous. He finds very weak arguments in particular articles, and knows not whether it is more preposterous to infer the extirpation of Episcopacy from such slender reasons or to attribute, as they do, all civil grievances to church government: "not a patent, not a Monopoly, not the price of a commodity raised, but these men make Bishops the cause of it" (pp. 8-9). There is no logic, no reasoning in their demands: "It were want of Logick in mee to expect it from a multitude, . . ." There is a multitude of allegations, a multitude of instances of abuses, and it is inferred that because of the abuses the institution should be abolished. "As if they should say, that because Drunkennesse and Adultery are growne so epidemicall, as is alleadged in the Petition, Let there be no more use of Wine, nor of Women in the Land." Digby especially resents what he considers the presumption of the petitioners: "For the bold part of this Petition, Sir, what can there bee of greater presumption, then for Petitioners, not only to prescribe to a Parliament, what, and how it shall doe; but for a multitude to teach a Parliament, what, and what is not, the government according to Gods word" (pp. 10-11). He is confident that no man of judgment will think it fit for a Parliament under a monarchy "to give countenance to irregular, and tumultuous assemblies, bee it for never so good an end: . . ." We must, declares Digby, uphold the dignity of what former Parliaments have done, "even in those things which in their due time wee may desire, and intend to reverse."

No wonder that the matter and the tone of this attack deeply offended some enemies of Episcopacy. S. R. Gardiner observed that it "was with the sure instinct of a true debater that Nathaniel Fiennes, Lord Saye's second son, replied to Digby and not to Falkland," who also found fault with Episcopacy but urged its



retention.<sup>1</sup> That Milton, although no member of Parliament, also had the true debater's gift, the following evidence will show. In the enumeration of arguments, the order is Digby, then Milton, Milton's rejoinder being cited immediately after each point that Digby makes. For convenience of reference, similar items have the same numbers; they are distinguished by the first letter of the author's last name: thus, the first item from Digby is 1 (D); the first from Milton is 1 (M).<sup>2</sup>

1 (D). I beseech you gentlemen let us not be led by passion to popular and vulgar Errors, it is naturall (as I tould you before) to the multitude to fly into Extremes, that seemes ever the best to them, that is most opposite to the present object of their hate. Wise Councells (M. Speaker) must square their Resolutions by another measure, by what's most just, most honourable, most convenient: Beleeve mee, Sir, great alterations of Government are rarely accompanied with any of these.

M. Speaker, we all agree upon this; that a Reformation of Church Government is most necessary, . . . but, Sir, to strike at the Roote, to attempt a totall Alteration, before ever I can give my vote unto that, three things must be made manifest unto mee (pp. 15-16).

1 (M). We must not run they say into sudden extreems. This is a fallacious Rule, unlesse understood only of the actions of Vertue about things indifferent, for if it be found that those two extreames be Vice and Vertue, Falshood and Truth, the greater extremity of Vertue and superlative Truth we run into, the more vertuous, and the more wise wee become; and hee that flying from degenerate and traditional corruption, feares to shoot himselfe too far into the meeting imbraces of a Divinely-warranted Reformation, had better not have run at all. And for the suddennesses it cannot be fear'd. . . . Yet if it were sudden & swift, provided still it be from worse to better, certainly wee ought to hie us from evill like a torrent, and rid our selves of corrupt Discipline, as wee would shake fire out of our bosomes.

Speedy and vehement were the Reformations of all the good Kings of Juda, though the people had beene nuzzl'd in Idolatry never so long before; they fear'd not the bug-bear danger, nor the Lyon in the way that the sluggish and timorous Politician thinks he sees; . . . (p. 66).<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> *History of England* (London: Longmans, Green, and Company, 1884), ix. 279.

<sup>2</sup> Passages or phrases having verbal similarities are italicized. To prevent confusion, I have changed Milton's italic to roman. The first edition of Digby's *Speech* has almost no italic type.

<sup>3</sup> The phrase "the sluggish and timorous Politician" refers unmistakably to Digby.

2 (D). that Episcopacy a function deduced *through all ages* of Christs Church, from the *Apostles times* and continued by *the most venerable and sacred order Ecclesiasticall*; . . . (p. 16)

2 (M). Next they alledge the *antiquity of Episcopacy through all Ages*. What it was in the *Apostles time*, that questionlesse it must be still, and therein I trust the Ministers will be able to satisfie the Parliament. But if Episcopacie be taken for Prelacie, *all the Ages they can deduce it through*, will make it no more venerable then Papacie.

Most certaine it is (as all our Stories beare witnesse) that ever since their comming to the See of Canterbury for neere twelve hundred yeares, to speake of them in generall, they have beene in England to our Soules *a sad and dolefull succession of illiterate and blind guides: to our purses, and goods a wastfull band of robbers, a perpetuall havock, and rapine: To our state a continuall Hydra of mischiefe, and molestation, the forge of discord and Rebellion: This is the Trophey of their Antiquity, and boasted Succession through so many Ages* (p. 67).<sup>1</sup>

3 (D). a function dignified by the learning and Piety of so many Fathers of the Church, *glorified by so many Martyrdomes in the Primitive times, and some since our owne blessed Reformation* . . . (p. 16).

3 (M). And for those *Prelate-Martyrs they glory of*, they are to bee judg'd what they were by the Gospel, and not the Gospel to be tried by them.

And it is to be noted that if they were for Bishopricks and Ceremonies, it was in their prosperitie, and fulnes of bread, but in their persecution, which purifi'd them, and neer their death, which was their garland, they plainly dislik'd and condemn'd the Ceremonies, and threw away those Episcopall ornaments wherein they were instal'd, as foolish and detestable, for so the words of Ridley at his degradment, and his letter to Hooper expressly shew. Neither doth the Author of our Church History spare to record sadly *the fall* (for so he termes it) *and infirmities of these Martyrs, though we would deify them* (pp. 67-68).

4 (D). *a government admired* (I speake it knowingly) *by the learnedest of the Reformed Churches abroad* (p. 16).

4 (M). Lastly, whereas they adde that some *the learnedest of the reformed abroad admire our Episcopacy*, it had bin more for the strength of the Argument to tell us that som of the wisest Statesmen *admire it*, for thereby we might guesse them weary of the present discipline, as offensive to their State, which is the bugge we feare (p. 68).

5 (D). Secondly, such a frame of Government must be layde before

<sup>1</sup> Here it is obvious that the words underlined are to be contrasted with Digby's "the most venerable and sacred order Ecclesiastical."

us, as no time, no *Corruption* can make lyable to proportionable *inconveniences* with that which wee abolish. . . . I doe not beleeve there can *any other Government* bee proposed but will in time be subject to as great or greater inconvenience then *Episcopacy*, . . . as Divine as our inspection is into things not experimented, if we hearken to those that would quite extirpate *Episcopacy*, I am confident that in steed of every Bishop wee put downe in a Diocese, *wee shall set up a Pope in every Parish* (pp. 16-17).

- 5 (M). The next objection vanishes of it selfe, *propounding a doubt, whether a greater inconvenience would not grow from the corruption of any other discipline, then from that of Episcopacy*. This seemes an unseasonable foresight, and out of order to deferre, and put off the most needful constitution of one right discipline, while we stand ballancing the *discommodity's of two corrupt ones*. First constitute that which is right, and of it selfe it will discover, and rectify that which swervs, and easily remedy the *pretended feare of having a Pope in every Parish* (pp. 68-69).
- 6 (D). Lastly M. Speaker, whether the subversion of *Episcopacy*, and the introducing of another kind of *Government* bee practicable, I leave it to those to judge who have considered the *connexion and interweaving of the Church Government with the Common Law*, to those who heard the Kings Speech to us the other Day, or who have looked into reason of state (pp. 17-18).
- 6 (M). At another doubt of theirs I wonder ; whether *this discipline which we desire, be such as can be put in practise* within this Kingdom, *they say it cannot stand with the common Law*, nor with the Kings safety ; the government of *Episcopacy*, is now so *weav'd into the common Law* : In Gods name let it *weave out againe* ; let not humain quillets keep back divine authority. Tis not the *common Law*, nor the civil, but piety, and justice, that are our foundresses ; they stoop not, neither change colour for Aristocracy, democracy, or Monarchy (p. 69).
- 7 (D). For my part (though no Statesman I will speake my mind freely in this) *I do not thinke a King can put downe Bishops totally with safety to Monarchy* ; not that there is any such Alliance as men talke of 'twixt the Myter and the Crowne, but from this reason ; *that upon the putting downe of Bishops, the Government of Assemblies is likely to succeed it*. That (to bee effectuall) must draw to it selfe the supremacy of Ecclesiasticall Jurisdiction that (consequently) the power of Excommunicating Kings as well as any other Brother in Christ, and if a King chance to be delivered over to Sathan, Judge whether men are likely to care much what becomes of him next (p. 18).

- 7 (M). Lastly, *they are fearfull that the discipline which will succeed cannot stand with the Ks. safety.* Wherefore? it is but Episcopacy reduc't to what it should be, . . . But wherein is this propounded government so shrewd? *Because the government of assemblies will succeed.* Did not the Apostles govern the Church by assemblies, how should it else be Catholick, how should it have Communion? . . . O but the consequence: *Assemblies draw to them the Supremacy of Ecclesiasticall jurisdiction.* No surely, *they draw no Supremacy*, but that authority which Christ, and Saint Paul in his name confers upon them. . . . But is this all? No, *this Ecclesiasticall Supremacy draws to it the power to excommunicate Kings; and then followes the worst that can be imagin'd.* Doe they hope to avoyd this by keeping Prelates that have so often don it? . . . (p. 70). [Milton proceeds in the strongest terms to condemn the Episcopal attitude with regard to excommunication and to justify the civil and political record of reformed churches beyond seas; he then sums up the matter:] But let us not for feare of a scarre-crow, or else through hatred to be reform'd stand hankering and politizing, when God with spread hands testifies to us, and points out the way to our peace (p. 73).

In the passages quoted even a casual reader will observe points of contact. A careful analysis will demonstrate that Milton answered Digby's *Speech* alone. The italicized passages reveal the exactness with which Milton caught up Digby's phrasing. Obviously he worked with a copy of the *Speech* before him. Of course, in refuting Digby he considered that he was dealing a body-blow to the whole cause of Episcopacy. Perhaps I should add that, in addition to other pamphlets, I have consulted the works cited by Mr. Hale as having possible bearings on Milton's answers in *Of Reformation*, and that in none of these is there any evidence of a direct connection with Milton's pamphlet. But under the circumstances such assurance is scarcely needed. The passages cited above, with their sharp contrast of arguments and their astonishing similarity of phrasing, furnish conclusive proof that Milton answered Digby alone. This evidence lends a lively interest to the close of Milton's great pamphlet. In the quiet of his study, this David, we observe, did not wield his sling against imaginary antagonists; he aimed point-blank at the single uncircumcised Philistine who had defied the armies of the living God—and the Lord was with him. If Book V of *Paradise Lost* had been written before *Of Reformation*, we should have had in Abdiel a remarkable parallel

with Milton in this ecclesiastical controversy, and in the following lines an amazing prophecy of the ruin of Digby and his party :

O alienate from God, O spirit accurst,  
Forsak'n of all good ; I see thy fall  
Determin'd, and thy hapless crew involv'd  
In this perfidious fraud, contagion spread  
Both of thy crime and punishment : henceforth  
No more be troubl'd how to quit the yoke  
Of Gods *Messiah* : those indulgent Laws  
Will not now be voutsaf't, other Decrees  
Against thee are gon forth without recall ;  
That Golden Scepter which thou didst reject  
Is now an Iron Rod to bruise and breake  
Thy disobedience.

## ASPECTS OF LIFE AND THOUGHT IN *ROBINSON CRUSOE*

BY HANS W. HÄUSERMANN

(Continued)

### III.—THE COMMERCIAL ELEMENT IN *ROBINSON CRUSOE*

#### 1. *The Character of the Middle-Class in "Robinson Crusoe."*

The first two pages of the novel contain a long panegyric of the middle-class station in life. Robinson Crusoe's father draws his son's attention to the fact that "the calamities of life were shared among the upper and lower part of mankind; but that the middle station had the fewest disasters, and was not exposed to so many vicissitudes as the higher or lower part of mankind" (p. 17). This praise of the secure life of a "bourgeois" was calculated to captivate the reader. Defoe did not write his book for the learned, he wrote it for the large public of tradesmen, apprentices, and shopkeepers. *Robinson Crusoe* is Defoe's first novel, and the reasons why he turned from journalism and miscellaneous writing to prose fiction was "an increasing desire to make money through his pen in order to portion his daughters."<sup>1</sup> This is an explanation of the numerous traits in the novel which are clearly in the range and to the taste of a middle-class reader.

What strikes us most is Defoe's way of describing such scenes as were likely to produce terror and astonishment in the reader. Thus, in the first and in the last scenes of his book, he managed to describe adventures with wild beasts, such as lions, wolves, and bears. Nothing could be better calculated to secure an uncultivated reader's attention than the description of such thrilling scenes as that of the terrible storm on the coast of England in which Robinson Crusoe and the whole crew of the ship almost perished (p. 20), than the description of the "horrible noises and hideous cries and

<sup>1</sup> W. P. Trent, in *The Cambridge History of English Literature*, vol. ix, p. 19.



howlings," produced by the beasts on the coast of Guinea (p. 24), Robinson's near escape from death through his being thrown on the shore of his island by huge waves which he describes as follows: "... for I saw the sea come after me as high as a great hill, and as furious as an enemy, which I had no means or strength to contend with" (p. 30). Defoe's middle-class reader did not ask for refined literary achievements. He craved for thrilling adventures, exciting scenes of battles, earthquakes (pp. 41, 42), tempests and the like. Defoe knew how to keep his reader in anxious suspense and how to relax the tension by introducing at the last moment a miraculous deliverance. Thus, for instance, Robinson Crusoe fell upon the savages at a very well-timed moment when they were going to kill the Spaniard: "I had now," Robinson says, "not a moment to lose, for nineteen of the dreadful wretches sat upon the ground all close huddled together, and had just sent the other two to butcher the poor Christian . . . and they were stooped down to untie the bands at his feet. I turned to Friday. Now, Friday, said I, do as I bid thee. . . ." (p. 91).

A large share of the book's popularity with the middle-class reader is due to the strong comic element which Defoe introduced into the novel. Defoe's humour is not a refined and delicate one, it very often borders on the burlesque. Thus, after the terrible scene of the battle with the cannibals and the rescuing of the Spaniard and Friday's father, Defoe depicts the immense joy of Friday at the sight of his father: "It would have moved any one to tears," says Robinson Crusoe, "to have seen how Friday kissed him, cried, laughed, halloed, jumped about, danced, sung, then cried again, wrung his hands, beat his own face and head, and then sung and jumped about again like a distracted creature" (pp. 92, 93). Friday is the comic figure of the novel. Robinson Crusoe in person is far too severe and gloomy a Puritan to be able to induce the reader to smile. Friday's expressive gestures, his naïve words, and his sheer good-nature form a sympathetic contrast to the prim and proper figure of his master.

Some other traits in this novel which clearly indicate that it was calculated to appeal to the middle-class reader can easily be found. The circumstantial descriptions of Robinson Crusoe's manual labour were sure to interest any of his readers employed in similar occupations. Robinson's habit of "taking a dram" before he undertook a difficult business or in order to give himself courage

is characteristic of the members of his social class. Very popular is the remedy which Robinson Crusoe applied against the violent cold he had caught: he ate green tobacco leaves soaked in rum (p. 46). The theological instruction which he conveyed by way of soliloquy to the reader is by no means above the powers of comprehension of the average middle-class man. One exemplary passage begins like this: "As I sat there, some such thoughts as these occurred to me. What is the earth and sea, of which I have seen so much? . . . Sure we are all made by some secret power, who formed the earth and sea, the air and sky; and who is that?—Then it followed, most naturally: it is God that has made it all" (p. 45).

## 2. *The Character of the Merchant.*

When discussing the ethics of the Puritan merchant, we saw that his chief qualities were prudence, honesty, diligence, moderation, sobriety, and thrift. They are the essential qualities of the middle-class, and, during his life on the island, Robinson Crusoe acquired them all. He belonged to the middle-class and was told so by his father, who said: "that mine (Robinson's) was the middle state, or what might be called the upper station of low life, which he had found by long experience was the best state in the world, the most suited to human happiness" (p. 17). Though the author personally had not been fortunate in his commercial enterprises, Robinson Crusoe, the hero whom Defoe created, grew rich by his trade. Defoe had evidently in his youth been fascinated by the seafaring merchants of his time. He learned that overseas trade was very lucrative and, therefore, he liked to send his imagination wandering into foreign countries and over far seas. Defoe was destined by his parents for the ministry; Robinson Crusoe was designed for the law (p. 17). Defoe renounced his career as a Non-conformist divine and took to trade; Robinson Crusoe, irresistibly attracted by the wonderful life of the seafaring merchants, ran away from home and enlisted on a ship.

Despite his "wandering inclination," Robinson Crusoe has all the essential qualities of a merchant. The contempt he professes for the money which he could not use on his island seems to be elaborately strained: "I had," says he, "a parcel of money, as well gold as silver, about thirty-six pounds sterling; alas! there

the nasty, sorry, useless stuff lay ; I had no manner of business for it, and I often thought with myself, that I would have given a handful of it for a gross of tobacco pipes, or for a hand-mill to grind my corn " (p. 57). The value which Robinson normally attributed to riches appears clearly when he learns that he has become a millionaire during his absence on the island. " It is impossible," says he, " to express the flutterings of my very heart when I looked over these letters, and especially when I found all my wealth about me ; . . . In a word, I turned pale and grew sick, and had not the old man ran and fetched me a cordial, I believe the sudden surprise of joy had upset nature, and I had died upon the spot. Nay, after that I continued very ill, and was so some hours, till a physician being sent for . . . he ordered me to be let blood, after which I had relief and grew well ; but I verily believe, if I had not been eased by the vent given in that manner to the spirits, I should have died " (p. 107 f.).

This intensity of emotion seems the more astonishing as Robinson is usually level-headed and master of himself in the most trying circumstances. He would never have been able to rescue Friday and the Spaniard from the hands of the cannibals if he had not executed his plan of action with as much courage as cool calculation. When attacked by more than three hundred ravenous wolves, he managed to direct the fire of his small troop with such admirable calmness, that he was able to have still a reserve volley in store : " I was loath to spend our last shot too hastily ; so I called my servant . . . and giving him a horn of powder, I bade him lay a train all along the pieces of timber . . ." (p. 113).

We have seen that this domination of instinct and emotion by will is ultimately a result of the ascetic doctrine of Puritanism. To the same religious source can be traced the spirit of drudgery, the effort of unceasing hard labour which we discover in Robinson Crusoe. He worked very hard, especially during the first days of his confinement on the island. Speaking of his primitive method of making boards, he says : " It is true, by this method I could make but one board out of a whole tree, but this I had no remedy for but patience, any more than I had for the prodigious deal of time and labour which it took me up to make a plank or board " (p. 38). On May 6 he writes in his diary : " Worked on the wreck, got several iron bolts out of her, and other pieces of iron work, worked very hard, and came home very much tired, and had thoughts

of giving it over" (p. 43). But he returned to work on the wreck on the following days and afterwards every day for more than a fortnight. He indeed lived up to his maxim, never to abandon that which he had once begun: "... for I seldom gave anything over without accomplishing it, when I once had it in my head enough to begin it" (p. 70).

### 3. *The Habits of the Merchant.*

When concluding some business, Robinson always insists on having a written contract if possible signed by a lawyer. In this habit he makes not even an exception with his dearest friends (p. 107). One might ask oneself where Robinson could have learned these commercial usages, having spent twenty-eight years of his life on a desert island and having never been an apprentice in a trader's business. He had even a manifest aversion to anything like a trade: "I was now eighteen years old, which was too late to go apprentice to a trade, or clerk to an attorney . . . it was not till almost a year after this that I broke loose, though in the meantime I continued obstinately deaf to all proposals of settling down to business" (p. 18). The answer to the question is that Defoe gave his hero the benefit of all the experience and knowledge in commerce which he had acquired in the course of his own life.

Frequent disclosures in the narrative show us that the commercial instinct played a strong and important part in the everyday life of our hero. Hübener, in his study on "Der Kaufmann Robinson Crusoe," thinks it legitimate to speak of the "Erfülltheit des Romans (I. Teil) im Inselleben des Helden so gut wie in der Vorgeschichte und am Schlusse von kaufmännischem, frühkapitalistischem Geiste."<sup>1</sup> Though this statement may contain some exaggeration, it is true that Robinson Crusoe shows a clear predilection for the use of certain commercial methods, such as accounts, balance-sheets, a journal, and catalogues of goods.

If Robinson wants to bring clearness into his thoughts, he writes them down in the form of a balance-sheet: on the left or debit side he writes, for instance, all the causes why he has to complain over his misfortunes, and on the right hand side he puts as many reasons why he can console himself. The words and ideas with which he

<sup>1</sup> G. Hübener, "Der Kaufmann Robinson Crusoe," *Englische Studien*, 1920, liv, pp. 367-398.

introduces this balance-sheet are characteristic: he uses conscientiously the technical expressions of business-life: "I now began to consider seriously my condition and the circumstance I was reduced to, and I drew up the state of my affairs in writing, not so much to leave them to any that were to come after me, for I was like to have but few heirs, as to deliver my thoughts from daily poring upon them . . . and as my reason began now to master my despondency, I began to comfort myself as well as I could, and to set the good against the evil, that I might have something to distinguish my case from worse; and I stated it very impartially, like debtor and creditor, the comforts I enjoyed against the miseries I suffered, thus:—" (p. 37).

We find many more examples of this habit of making commercial accounts whenever there was an opportunity of so doing. Thus, Robinson enumerates the reasons he has to risk sailing on his raft from the wreck to the island: "I had three encouragements," says he, "1st. A smooth, calm sea. 2nd. The tide rising, and setting in to the shore. 3rd. What little wind there was blew me towards the land" (p. 32). A similar list contains the required qualities of a dwelling-place: "I consulted several things in my situation which I found would be proper for me: 1st. Health, and fresh water. . . . 2ndly, Shelter from the heat of the sun. 3rdly, Security from ravenous creatures, whether man or beast. 4thly, A view to the sea . . ." (p. 35). The conscientiousness and exactness with which Robinson draws up these accounts is remarkable. In like manner he gives a division of the year and the months according to the seasons: "I found now that the seasons of the year might generally be divided . . . into the rainy seasons and the dry seasons, which were generally thus:

Half February	}	Rainy, the sun being then on or near the equinox.
March		
Half April	}	Dry, the sun being then to the north of the line."
Half April		
May		
June		
July		
Half August		

And in this manner he goes on for the whole course of the year (p. 50).

Very interesting from this point of view is the description given by Robinson Crusoe of his day's work. It shows at the same time the methodical, rationalistic tendency of his character: ". . . I was very seldom idle, having regularly divided my time according to the several daily employments that were before me, such as, first, my duty to God and reading the scriptures, which I constantly set apart some time for thrice every day. Secondly, the going abroad with gun for food, which generally took me up three hours every morning when it did not rain. Thirdly, the ordering, curing, preserving, and cooking what I had killed or caught for my supply . . ." (p. 52).

Robinson Crusoe is methodical in all his doings. He carefully considers the reasons *pro* and *contra* before he takes in hand some work. Thus, for instance, after having decided to protect his flock of goats from all dangers, he continues: "To this purpose, after long consideration, I could think but of two ways to preserve them: one was to find another convenient place . . . and the other was to inclose two or three little bits of land . . . and this, though it would require a great deal of time and labour, I thought was the most rational design" (p. 68).

Robinson Crusoe obviously strives to regulate his life in a way most appropriate to the laws of reason. He determines beforehand what he is going to eat: "my food was regulated thus: I eat a bunch of raisins for my breakfast, a piece of the goat's flesh, or of the turtle, for my dinner . . . and two or three of the turtle's eggs for supper" (p. 49).

Another commercial form often used by Robinson Crusoe is the inventory or catalogue. He has the shopkeeper's pride when he says: "I had the biggest magazine of all kinds now that ever was laid up, I believe, for one man; but I was not satisfied still; for, while the ship sat upright in that posture, I thought I ought to get everything out of her that I could . . ." (p. 34). And later on: "So that had my cave been to be seen, it looked like a general magazine of all necessary things; and I had everything so readily at my hand, that it was a great pleasure to me to see all my goods in such order, and especially to find my stock of all necessities so great" (p. 38). The things he found in the ship are enumerated thus: "in the carpenter's stores, I found two or three bags full of nails and spikes, a great screw-jack, a dozen or two of hatchets, and, above all, that most useful thing, called a grind-stone. All



these I secured, together with several things belonging to the gunner, particularly two or three iron crows, two barrels of musket bullets, seven muskets, and another fowling-piece, with some small quantity of powder more ; a large bag-full of small shot, and a great roll of sheet-lead. . . . Besides these things, I took all the men's clothes that I could find, and a spare fore-topsail, a hammock, and some bedding . . ." (p. 33). His exactness goes so far as to note carefully the charge of the guns with which he shoots the cannibals : " I prepared two muskets and my ordinary fowling-piece. The two muskets I loaded with a brace of slugs each, and four or five smaller bullets, about the size of pistol bullets, and the fowling-piece I loaded with near a handful of swan-shot of the largest size ; I also loaded my pistols with about four bullets each " (p. 70). Another enumeration, very characteristic of the commercial and methodical habits of Defoe, is this : " Our strength was now thus ordered for the expedition : 1. The captain, his mate, and passenger. 2. Then the two prisoners of the first gang . . . 3. The other two whom I kept till now in my bower pinioned . . . 4. These five released at last . . ." (p. 103).

Another passage which bears witness to the book-keeping habits of which Robinson Crusoe was so fond is this : " . . . The account of the rest is as follows :

- 3 Killed at our shot from the tree.
- 2 Killed at the next shot.
- 2 Killed by Friday in the boat.
- 2 Killed by ditto, of those at first wounded.
- 1 Killed by ditto, in the wood.
- 3 Killed by the Spaniard.
- 4 Killed, being found dropped here and there, of their wounds, or killed by Friday in chase of them.
- 4 Escaped in the boat, whereof one wounded, if not dead.

—  
21 in all " (p. 92).

Another instance of Robinson Crusoe's commercial way of thinking is his diary, which he calls significantly enough " journal." Feeling the obligation to render himself an account " of every day's employment " (p. 38), he began this diary and, a few weeks later, had to leave it off, " for having no more ink " (p. 38).

IV.—THE SOCIAL ELEMENT IN *ROBINSON CRUSOE*1. *Robinson Crusoe's Egoism.*

The loneliness of the individual man in the sight of God, his isolation in the middle of human society, is one of the cardinal traits of Calvinism. In the most important question of human life, the question of salvation, man stands alone and with nobody to help him. No church and no priest can be of any use to the Calvinist. He does not believe in the miracle-working power of the sacraments. He despises such a belief as superstition and blasphemy. The result is a cold individualism. Social intercourse is no more based on mutual love and understanding, but on distrust and reckless egoism. Bunyan's pilgrim is characteristic of this frame of mind. As soon as the divine call has awakened him, he leaves wife and children to themselves, holds his hands over his ears, and runs away across the fields towards his heavenly destination. Only when he sees himself safe, he begins to think of his family and thinks it were very soothing if they could be with him. Love for one's neighbour is not a matter of spontaneous affection with the Puritan. He exercises charity because it is also a means of contributing to the greater glory of God, because the Bible commands him to do so. His relation to his neighbour is therefore an impersonal one, it is part of his striving for a rational life and rational society. Calvinism has bred those "saints" who give clearly the impression of a heroic life, and who are iron-hard and clear-headed in "a world of troubles."

The self-consciousness of the "elect" is sometimes but little different from the conceit and vain gloriousness of the "lost." Thus we find in Robinson Crusoe a firm belief in the great importance which his personal salvation has for God and the Devil. He quite seriously considers the possibility of a visit paid him by Satan: "I had no sleep that night," says he, speaking about the day when he had discovered the footprint on the shore. ". . . Sometimes I fancied it must be the devil; and reason joined in with me upon this supposition. . . . But then to think that Satan should take human shape upon him in such a place, where there could be no manner of occasion for it, but to leave the print of his foot behind him, and that even for no purpose too (for he could not be sure I should see it), this was an amazement the other way; I considered that the devil might have found out abundance of other ways to

have terrified me, than this of the single print of a foot ; that as I lived quite on the other side of the island, he would never have been so simple to leave a mark in a place where it was ten thousand to one whether I should ever see it or not . . . all this seemed inconsistent with the thing itself, and with all notions we usually entertain of the subtlety of the devil " (pp. 65, 66). It appears clearly from passages like this that Robinson Crusoe is decidedly self-assertive and thinks himself the centre of the world. He discovers the mysterious influence of the heavenly powers in his life : September 20 is the day on which all the remarkable events in his life fell. Thus he says : " The same day of the year I was born on viz., the 20th of September, the same day I had my life so miraculously saved twenty-six years after, when I was cast on shore in this island ; so that my wicked life and solitary life," *sc.* holy life, " both began on a day " (p. 59). The self-complacent and egotistic attitude of Robinson Crusoe manifests itself strikingly in his exclamations of satisfaction at being different from the cannibals : " When I came a little out of that part of the island," *sc.* where he had seen the marks of the inhuman feastings of the savages, " I looked up with the utmost affection of my soul, and, with a flood of tears in my eyes, gave God thanks, that had cast my lot in a part of the world where I was distinguished from such dreadful creatures as these . . . and this above all, that I had, even in this miserable condition, been comforted with the knowledge of himself and the hope of his blessing, which was a felicity more than sufficiently equivalent to all the misery which I had suffered or could suffer " (p. 69).

This self-complacency and egoism appear more often in things which Robinson Crusoe does not say than in those which he says, and actions speak louder than words. Thus, on his flight from Salee, he had to choose whether to throw Xury, the young boy, or the grown-up Moor overboard. The Moor is strong enough to swim to the shore, whereas the boy would have been drowned. What prevented Robinson from dispatching Xury was no humanitarian reason whatever—his own interest alone decided the question : " I could have been content to have taken this Moor with me, and have drowned the boy ; but there was no venturing to trust him " (p. 23). He wants a strong and capable servant, and a humble and admiring companion at the same time. Later again he wants Xury on his island : " Now I wished for my boy Xury and the long-boat, with the shoulder-of-mutton sail, with which I had sailed

above a thousand miles on the coast of Africa ; but this was in vain " (p. 56). On his journey through the Pyrenees, he has no word of compassion or common kindness for the guide who had been wounded by the wolves. He leaves him behind with the cold remark : " The next morning our guide was so ill, and his limbs so swelled with the rankling of his two wounds, that he could go no further ; so we were obliged to take a new guide there . . ." (p. 113).

## 2. *Robinson Crusoe's Domineering Attitude.*

This reckless and egoistic attitude towards one's neighbour results naturally in a strong impulse to dominate and to command. Even among the dumb animals of his household on the island Robinson Crusoe is fond of asserting his position as their absolute master : " It would have made a stoic smile," he says, " to have seen me and my little family sit down to dinner ; there was my majesty, the prince and lord of the whole island ; I had the lives of all my subjects at absolute command ; I could hang, draw, give life and liberty, and take it away, and no rebels among all my subjects. Then to see how like a king I dined too, all alone, attended by my servants. Pol, as if he had been my favourite, was the only person permitted to talk to me ; my dog, which was now grown very old and crazy . . . sat always at my right hand ; and two cats, one on one side the table, and one on the other, expecting now and then a bit from my hand, as a mark of special favour " (p. 63). The first words in English which Friday has to learn are his own name and that of Robinson Crusoe, which is " master " : " I likewise taught him to say master, and then let him know that was to be my name " (p. 82). Robinson Crusoe is very fond of comparing himself to a king. After the rescue of the Spaniard and of Friday's father he thinks himself entitled to say : " My island was now peopled, and I thought myself very rich in subjects, and it was a merry reflection which I frequently made, how like a king I looked ; first of all the whole country was my own property, so that I had an undoubted right of dominion ; secondly, my people were perfectly subjected, I was absolute lord and law-giver ; they all owed their lives to me, and were ready to lay down their lives, if there had been occasion for it, for me " (p. 93). He is fond of hearing himself called " His Excellency," " Commander,"

or "Governor." His overbearing desire for domination reaches its highest point when he is allowed to act the part of Providence and to influence decisively men's lives. He describes at great length Friday's expressions of gratitude when he had just been saved from death; "... and I could then perceive that he stood trembling, as if he had been taken prisoner . . . and he came nearer and nearer, kneeling down every ten or twelve steps. . . . At length he came close to me, and then he kneeled down again, kissed the ground, and laid his head upon the ground, and taking me by the foot, set my foot upon his head . . ." (p. 81). Robinson Crusoe is apparently very pleased when the marooned Spanish captain takes him for an angel: "Gentlemen, said I, do not be surprised at me, perhaps you may have a friend near you when you did not expect it.—He must be sent directly from heaven, then, said one of them very gravely to me, pulling off his hat at the same time. . . . All help is from heaven, said I. . . . The poor man, with tears running down his face, and trembling, looking like one astonished, returned, Am I talking to God or man? Is it a real man or an angel?—Be in no fear about that, sir, said I . . ." (p. 98).

Robinson Crusoe is the born military commander: he has authority and knows how to impose it. When with Friday he attacks the cannibals at their horrible feast, he never loses his complete self-possession; and his orders to Friday are sharp, clear, and decisive (p. 91). He has a strong sense of the measures to take in a dangerous situation. When commander over an "army" of eight men, he resolved the most arduous problems of strategy. He divided the troop of mutinous sailors and attacked and overwhelmed them singly. He worked out a most ingenious plan for the seizing of the ship, a project which the captain "liked wonderfully well" (p. 102). On the journey through the Pyrenees, he proved to be a leader full of prudence and courage, so that the members of the little caravan were entirely justified in relying unreservedly upon him. Although Robinson Crusoe was a man of the middle-class, he had the genius of the born commander. He knew how to organize carefully all his enterprises and carried them through with authority. His rational and ingenious designs invariably commanded success, and they call forth the reader's sympathetic interest; and this ability of Robinson Crusoe's probably reflects Defoe's own position as director of the Pantile Works at Tilbury, where he commanded a great body of workmen.

3. *Robinson Crusoe's Patriarchal Ideas.*

Akin to this authoritative tendency in Robinson Crusoe's character is his idea of the patriarchal power belonging to the head of the family. According to the Calvinistic doctrine of the *patria potestas*, the power of a father is unlimited.<sup>1</sup>

Defoe was married and had six children. But he does not seem to have had much authority over his sons: he complains in a letter, that his son Benjamin, whom he had entrusted with the administration of all his goods, withheld his mother's and his sister's property and thus obliged them "to beg their bread at his door."<sup>2</sup>

Obedience to the commands of his parents is the first duty of a child. Robinson Crusoe considered being cast on a desert island a proper and well-deserved punishment for his disobedience to his father's commands. He says: "... through all the varieties of miseries that had to this day befallen me, I never had so much as one thought of it being the hand of God, or that it was a just punishment for my sin, my rebellious behaviour against my father . . ." (p. 44). The repentant sailor Atkins, in the course of a conversation with Robinson, confessed that nothing pained him more than the idea of all the sorrow and grief he had caused his father through disobedience: "whenever we come to look back upon our lives, the sins against our indulgent parents are certainly the first that touch us, the wounds they make lie deepest, and the weight they leave will lie heaviest upon the mind of all the sins we can commit."<sup>3</sup>

According to a Calvinistic doctrine, family life should, on a correspondingly smaller scale, emulate that of the Church, with all affection directed towards Christ as the spiritual head. There is not much room left for love among the members of the family themselves.<sup>4</sup> Duty and reverence serve instead. The only mention which Robinson Crusoe makes of his sisters on coming back from his island is singularly like a business remark: "At the same time," he says, "I sent my two sisters in the country each of them a hundred pounds, they being, though not in want, yet not in very good circumstances; one having been married and left a widow,

<sup>1</sup> P. Lobstein, *Die Ethik Calvins in ihren Grundzügen entworfen*, Strassburg, 1877, p. 105.

<sup>2</sup> *Dictionary of National Biography*, xiv, p. 290.

<sup>3</sup> *Further Adventures*, p. 47.

<sup>4</sup> Cf. P. Lobstein, *op. cit.*, p. 104.



or "Governor." His overbearing desire for domination reaches its highest point when he is allowed to act the part of Providence and to influence decisively men's lives. He describes at great length Friday's expressions of gratitude when he had just been saved from death; "... and I could then perceive that he stood trembling, as if he had been taken prisoner . . . and he came nearer and nearer, kneeling down every ten or twelve steps. . . . At length he came close to me, and then he kneeled down again, kissed the ground, and laid his head upon the ground, and taking me by the foot, set my foot upon his head . . ." (p. 81). Robinson Crusoe is apparently very pleased when the marooned Spanish captain takes him for an angel: "Gentlemen, said I, do not be surprised at me, perhaps you may have a friend near you when you did not expect it.—He must be sent directly from heaven, then, said one of them very gravely to me, pulling off his hat at the same time. . . . All help is from heaven, said I. . . . The poor man, with tears running down his face, and trembling, looking like one astonished, returned, Am I talking to God or man? Is it a real man or an angel?—Be in no fear about that, sir, said I . . ." (p. 98).

Robinson Crusoe is the born military commander: he has authority and knows how to impose it. When with Friday he attacks the cannibals at their horrible feast, he never loses his complete self-possession; and his orders to Friday are sharp, clear, and decisive (p. 91). He has a strong sense of the measures to take in a dangerous situation. When commander over an "army" of eight men, he resolved the most arduous problems of strategy. He divided the troop of mutinous sailors and attacked and overwhelmed them singly. He worked out a most ingenious plan for the seizing of the ship, a project which the captain "liked wonderfully well" (p. 102). On the journey through the Pyrenees, he proved to be a leader full of prudence and courage, so that the members of the little caravan were entirely justified in relying unreservedly upon him. Although Robinson Crusoe was a man of the middle-class, he had the genius of the born commander. He knew how to organize carefully all his enterprises and carried them through with authority. His rational and ingenious designs invariably commanded success, and they call forth the reader's sympathetic interest; and this ability of Robinson Crusoe's probably reflects Defoe's own position as director of the Pantile Works at Tilbury, where he commanded a great body of workmen.

3. *Robinson Crusoe's Patriarchal Ideas.*

Akin to this authoritative tendency in Robinson Crusoe's character is his idea of the patriarchal power belonging to the head of the family. According to the Calvinistic doctrine of the *patria potestas*, the power of a father is unlimited.<sup>1</sup>

Defoe was married and had six children. But he does not seem to have had much authority over his sons: he complains in a letter, that his son Benjamin, whom he had entrusted with the administration of all his goods, withheld his mother's and his sister's property and thus obliged them "to beg their bread at his door."<sup>2</sup>

Obedience to the commands of his parents is the first duty of a child. Robinson Crusoe considered being cast on a desert island a proper and well-deserved punishment for his disobedience to his father's commands. He says: "... through all the varieties of miseries that had to this day befallen me, I never had so much as one thought of it being the hand of God, or that it was a just punishment for my sin, my rebellious behaviour against my father . . ." (p. 44). The repentant sailor Atkins, in the course of a conversation with Robinson, confessed that nothing pained him more than the idea of all the sorrow and grief he had caused his father through disobedience: "whenever we come to look back upon our lives, the sins against our indulgent parents are certainly the first that touch us, the wounds they make lie deepest, and the weight they leave will lie heaviest upon the mind of all the sins we can commit."<sup>3</sup>

According to a Calvinistic doctrine, family life should, on a correspondingly smaller scale, emulate that of the Church, with all affection directed towards Christ as the spiritual head. There is not much room left for love among the members of the family themselves.<sup>4</sup> Duty and reverence serve instead. The only mention which Robinson Crusoe makes of his sisters on coming back from his island is singularly like a business remark: "At the same time," he says, "I sent my two sisters in the country each of them a hundred pounds, they being, though not in want, yet not in very good circumstances; one having been married and left a widow,

<sup>1</sup> P. Lobstein, *Die Ethik Calvins in ihren Grundzügen entworfen*, Strassburg, 1877, p. 105.

<sup>2</sup> *Dictionary of National Biography*, xiv, p. 290.

<sup>3</sup> *Further Adventures*, p. 47.

<sup>4</sup> Cf. P. Lobstein, *op. cit.*, p. 104.

and the other having a husband not so kind to her as he should be" (p. 108). Robinson Crusoe loves his wife dearly, and when once this "sage counsellor was gone," he feels "like a ship without a pilot, that could only run before the wind."<sup>1</sup> It was she, who, with her wise counsels, kept him from following his "rambling genius."<sup>2</sup> Nevertheless, it is significant, that she died exactly at the moment when his "wandering disposition . . . like the returns of a violent distemper, came on with an irresistible force upon me, so that nothing could make any more an impression upon me."<sup>3</sup> It seems as if her life was less precious than her husband's felicity, which she had to buy at a great price, that of death itself.

G. von Schulze-Gaevernitz says: "Als Vorkämpfer des Kapitalismus haben Calvin und seine neuenglischen Nachfolger dem Grossbürgertum, der Klassenscheidung, der Sklaverei den Weg gebahnt."<sup>4</sup> We have seen that this spirit of domination reigned not only in society but also in the family of the Puritan. *Robinson Crusoe* contains many proofs of this statement.

#### V.—CONCLUSION

##### 1. *The Critics' Opinions.*

In the course of this study we have seen that Daniel Defoe's greatest novel presents three chief aspects of life and thought, a religious, a commercial, and a social aspect. We have been able to discern the spiritual links which connect these different elements with one another. It has become apparent that the three main elements penetrate each other, and that none of them stands isolated from and unaffected by the other two.

The different literary critics who have dealt with *Robinson Crusoe* have all of them declared one or the other of these elements to be the greatest one. On the whole, we can distinguish two kinds of opinion supported by students of Defoe's work: *Robinson Crusoe* is considered either as a novel which shows in its hero the matter-of-fact, ordinary, unromantic character of an English tradesman of the beginning of the eighteenth century, or throughout as an

<sup>1</sup> *Further Adventures*, p. 7.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 6.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 6.

<sup>4</sup> G. v. Schulze-Gaevernitz, "Die geistesgeschichtlichen Grundlagen der anglo-amerikanischen Weltsuprematie": *Archiv für Sozialwissenschaft und Sozialpolitik*, vols. 56, 58, 1926, 1927; p. 64 in vol. 58.

expression of Defoe's religious idea, a striking manifestation of Puritanism. We will now take a general survey of the two groups of critics, beginning with the supporters of the predominance of the religious aspect of the novel.

Trent considers the religious element in *Robinson Crusoe* of greater importance than any other sphere of life and thought. He writes: "Defoe wrote it [*sc. Robinson Crusoe*] for the edification, rather than for the delectation, of his readers, although he did not evade giving them pleasure and although, assuredly, he took pleasure himself in his own creation."<sup>1</sup>

And of the same opinion is Paul Dottin, the French critic and biographer of Defoe. He says: "En composant un récit fictif, ou, comme il finit par le prétendre, allégorique, dans le louable dessein de détourner du démon ses compatriotes hésitants, il ne faisait que suivre la grande voie lumineuse tracée par un des dieux de sa jeunesse, l'auteur illustre du 'Progrès du Pèlerin.' . . . De Foe, c'est Bunyan en costume laïque. . . ."<sup>2</sup>

Of the German critics we mention only Ullrich, Schöffler, and Dibelius. The latter finds in *Robinson Crusoe*'s character an interesting contrast of asceticism and energetic recklessness. *Robinson Crusoe* "ist ein Draufgänger und Asket zugleich."<sup>3</sup> Dibelius afterwards asserts, that Defoe endowed his hero with a reckless spirit only in order to throw into sharp relief another and more important feature of his character. By this acknowledgment Dibelius implies that he too considers the Puritan element of first importance in the novel.

Ullrich sees the solution of the problem in the "religiöse Betontheit" of *Robinson*'s character,<sup>4</sup> and Schöffler states, "dass das erbauliche Moment des Buches, wenn es dem Autor nicht im Vordergrund gestanden hat, doch von ihm in den Vordergrund geschoben worden ist."<sup>5</sup>

The opposite opinion is supported by two eminent critics of the last century, Leslie Stephen and William Minto. They consider *Robinson Crusoe*'s practical turn of mind of greater consequence than any other aspect of his character. They are chiefly

<sup>1</sup> *C.H.E.L.*, vol. ix, p. 20.

<sup>2</sup> *Op. cit.*, p. 326.

<sup>3</sup> W. Dibelius, *Englische Romankunst*, 2nd ed., Berlin and Leipzig, 1922, vol. i, p. 36.

<sup>4</sup> H. Ullrich, *Zum Robinsonproblem*, *Englische Studien*, vol. 55, p. 235.

<sup>5</sup> H. Schöffler, *Protestantismus und Literatur*, Leipzig, 1922, p. 161.

struck by the total absence of sentimental elements in the mind of the hero of the novel. Minto says: "All Defoe's heroes and heroines are animated by this practical spirit, this thoroughgoing subordination of means to end. When they have an end in view ... they allow neither passion, nor resentment, nor sentiment in any shape or form to stand in their way. Every other consideration is put on one side when the business of the shop has to be attended to. They are all tradesmen who have strayed into unlawful courses."<sup>1</sup>

It is also the matter-of-fact and prosaic character of Robinson Crusoe which chiefly appeals to Leslie Stephen. When speaking of the reasons which induced Defoe to write his first novel, he says: "He brings out the shrewd vigorous character of the Englishman thrown upon his own resources with evident enjoyment of his task," and later on he states the obvious "want of power in describing emotion as compared with the amazing power of describing facts."<sup>2</sup>

The strongest supporter of this side of the question is Gustav Hübener. His essay on "Der Kaufmann Robinson Crusoe" furnishes many arguments well worth considering. The extreme views taken by Hübener may be seen in this statement of his: "Das Ergebnis vorangehender Untersuchung zeigt, dass auch dort, wo im *Robinson Crusoe* nicht ausdrücklich von Geld und Geschäften die Rede ist, während des Insellebens, der Held den rechenhaften Menschentypus verkörpert, der als Träger der frühkapitalistischen Gesellschaftsordnung anzusehen ist."<sup>3</sup>

## 2. Summary.

We must try now to explain and, if possible, to reconcile these contradictory statements. In our first chapter we found that Defoe's religious feeling was very strong. Robinson Crusoe showed a sincere and ardent faith in the goodness of Providence, a high esteem and veneration for the word of God, the Bible, and, what is also full of significance, an unaffected dread of the Devil. On the other hand, it cannot be overlooked that the old Calvinistic doctrine appears strangely altered and changed in Defoe. Its

<sup>1</sup> W. Minto, *Daniel Defoe. English Men of Letters*, new edition, London, 1887, p. 156.

<sup>2</sup> L. Stephen, *Hours in a Library*, New York, 1875, p. 44.

<sup>3</sup> G. Hübener, *op. cit.*, vol. liv, p. 385.

original severity is mitigated, its sternness is less awful. When Defoe published *Robinson Crusoe*, Puritanism was fast losing its original force. As early as the year 1689 the Act of Toleration had established an approximate equality of rights between Anglicans and Puritans. Defoe himself believed in the possibility of a reconciliation of the two churches. Both of them should be indulgent and should endeavour to know and esteem each other. Thus he argued in his pamphlet on *The Shortest Way to Peace and Union*: "Dissenters should concede to the Church of England its great use and service in association of religion with the State, the Church in its turn conceding to Dissenters a full toleration."<sup>1</sup>

The genuine Calvinistic spirit was gone and Defoe had only retained its outward appearance as we found it in the methodical and rational character of his hero. There is a great difference between Bunyan's and Defoe's Puritanism. And what accounts for this difference is the influence of rationalism and liberalism. We have recognized in Robinson Crusoe a thorough merchant and a man full of the adventurous, enterprising spirit of his age. These traits in Robinson's character are not less strongly marked than the religious ones. One can explain and also excuse many apparent inconsistencies and many puzzling riddles in the behaviour of his hero, if one takes into account the fact that Defoe was a Dissenter and that the Calvinistic doctrine lies at the bottom of his soul. It appears to us, though, that this fact has been overrated by those critics who considered the religious element of primary importance. Daniel Defoe himself was not a fervent, not even a conscientious Dissenter. His life is anything but that of a strict follower of an austere creed and, as William Minto puts it: "We often find peeping out in Defoe's writings that roguish cynicism which we should expect in a man whose own life was far from being straightforward."<sup>2</sup>

On the other hand, Robinson Crusoe's practical turn of mind is so evident, the pleasure it affords him to struggle for his life and also for his comfort is so obvious, his resourcefulness so stupendous, and his adventurous spirit so unrestrained, that it seems legitimate to consider the commercial and social aspects of *Robinson Crusoe* of greater importance than the religious one. The main charm of the book is and has always been its adventurous hero; his singular

<sup>1</sup> H. Morley, *op. cit.*, p. 224.

<sup>2</sup> W. Minto, *op. cit.*, p. 155.



exploits and his ingenious expedients have kept in anxious suspense many a reader in the last two centuries.

We think it therefore best to conclude thus : the religious aspect of *Robinson Crusoe* is strongly marked and the spirit of the Puritan permeates the whole novel. Calvinistic theology often furnishes explanations for phenomena which it would be hard to explain in any other way. The commercial and social elements in the novel take first place in importance among the aspects of life and thought met with therein. They are, so to speak, the substance of the book and constitute also the larger part of its literary value.

## NOTES AND OBSERVATIONS

### SOME LAWSUITS OF NICHOLAS UDALL

FOUR of the five lawsuits here summarized relate to debts contracted by Udall between 1536 and 1546—that is, while he was headmaster of Eton and in the period that intervened between his dismissal from that post and his rise to prosperity under Edward VI and Mary. They supply details of the chronic indebtedness to which the dramatist confessed in the undated letter to an unknown patron, concerning his “restitution to the roume of Scholemaister in Eton,” that has often been quoted by his biographers.<sup>1</sup>

(i) *Henry Crede v. Nicholas Udall*. On March 9, 1535/6, soon after his appointment to Eton, Udall signed a bond undertaking to pay the sum of twenty pounds to Henry Crede, a clothman of Wilton, “at the ffeest of Easter next comyng.” He failed to carry out his promise, for on November 25, 1538, he was outlawed in the city of London as the result of proceedings instituted by Crede to obtain payment of his debt. The dispute subsequently came into the Court of Common Pleas,<sup>2</sup> where Crede commenced an action against Udall for repayment. Udall, who is described in the pleadings as “Nicholaus Vdall nuper de London Generosus alias dictus Nicholaus Vdall de Eyton in Com. Buck. Generosus,” alleged that he had duly repaid the debt at Fowey in Cornwall (“apud ffoye in Com. Cornub.”).<sup>3</sup> With the consent of both parties the suit was referred to a jury. The trial took place before the justices of assize at Launceston, but Udall did not appear and the jury gave a verdict for Crede. When a writ for Udall’s appearance was returned in the Court of Common Pleas in Michaelmas Term, 1544,<sup>4</sup> his attorney sought to take advantage of the recent Act of General Pardon<sup>5</sup> in order to obtain a reversal of Udall’s outlawry. The justices allowed this plea and decided that as Udall had already pleaded to the issue before a jury his case was covered by the terms of the Act. And so Udall’s outlawry was pardoned.

<sup>1</sup> B. M. Cotton MS. Titus, B. VIII, p. 271.

<sup>2</sup> Common Plea Roll, Michaelmas Term, 36 Henry VIII. P.R.O. reference: C.P. 40/1123, m. 452.

<sup>3</sup> In this connection it is, perhaps, worth noting that “An Answer to the articles of the comoners of Devonsheir and Cornewall” (Royal MS. 18, B. xi), written by Udall in 1549, purports to have been “sette foorth by a countryman of theirs”—i.e. of the men of Devon and Cornwall.

<sup>4</sup> C.P. 40/1123, m. 811.

<sup>5</sup> *Statutes of the Realm*, 35 Henry VIII, c. 18.

(ii) *Nicholas Udall v. Edward Clement*. In this case Udall appears as a creditor. On September 16, 1544, he lent £50 to Edward Clement, a Somersetshire gentleman, who promised repayment at the next Christmas. Clement defaulted, however, and in Michaelmas Term, 1545, Udall sued him in the King's Bench and won his case.<sup>1</sup> He was evidently unable to recover his debt; for on October 28, 1550, a writ exigent was directed to the Sheriffs of London commanding them to bring Clement before the Court again, to show cause why Udall should not recover his debt. The sheriffs reported the statutory number of times that Clement was not to be found within their jurisdiction, so Udall was granted execution against him.<sup>2</sup>

Udall is described in these proceedings as "*Nicholaus Vdall de London generosus nuper in Curia Domini Henrici nuper Regis Anglie Octavi*"—possibly a reference to the fact that during the last years of Henry VIII's reign he enjoyed the patronage of the queen, Katherine Parr, who encouraged him in his translation of part of Erasmus's *Paraphrase of the New Testament*.<sup>3</sup>

(iii) *Thomas Day v. Nicholas Udall*. On the day of his loan to Clement, September 16, 1544, Udall borrowed £40 from Thomas Day, a wax-chandler of London, undertaking to make repayment at the Christmas following. He failed to do so and eventually, in Trinity Term, 1548, Day summoned him before the Court of Common Pleas.<sup>4</sup> Udall admitted the debt and judgment was given for Day, but I have found no record of its execution.

(iv) *Herman Evans v. Nicholas Udall*. On October 17, 1544, Herman Evans lent Udall £4 17s. 10d. to be repaid at the Christmas following. Although one of the smallest of these transactions, this is by no means the least interesting, as it shows Udall in close relations with a member of the book trade. Evans had a substantial business as a bookseller in Oxford and is frequently mentioned in the University records between 1538 and 1563; his name also appears regularly among the "aliens" or "strangers" in the Oxford subsidy rolls from 1543 until 1559. Whether he was established at Oxford in the fifteen-twenties, when Udall was at Corpus Christi, is unknown.

In Michaelmas Term, 1553, Evans sued Udall for the amount of his loan and for losses arising out of the detention of his debt.<sup>5</sup> Udall succeeded in getting the case adjourned until the following Hilary Term, but then judgment was pronounced in favour of Evans.<sup>6</sup>

(v) *William Martyn v. Nicholas Udall*. On June 10, 1546, Udall sealed an obligation entitling him to receive from a certain William

<sup>1</sup> P.R.O.: K.B. 27/1136, m. 125.

<sup>2</sup> K.B. 27/1156, m. 84.

<sup>3</sup> It has not, I think, been noticed that Udall received £6 13s. 4d. from the queen as late as July, 1547, six months after the death of Henry VIII. P.R.O. *Book of Receipts and Payments of Katherine Parr*, E. 315/340, p. 25 verso. "Item to Nycholas Vdall by thandes of Thomas Gayle in Rewarde by the Quenes Highnes Comaundement declared by mres Blechington & mr. Hewylyk—vjti. xij<sup>s</sup>. iiijd."

<sup>4</sup> C.P. 40/1137, m. 541.

<sup>5</sup> C.P. 40/1156, m. 308.

<sup>6</sup> C.P. 40/1157, m. 510.

Martyn of London a gold ring worth four pounds—"quendam annulum auri valoris quatuor librarum"—for which he promised to pay ten pounds within ten days of the time when he should have twenty pounds a year more than he had on the day when the agreement was signed, whether by an annuity, by a grant from the king, or by any other means.

In the subsequent King's Bench proceedings<sup>1</sup> which Martyn brought against Udall he asserted that by the gift of the King (Edward VI) Udall obtained twenty pounds a year more than he had enjoyed previously on June 10, 1552, but refused to repay his debt when requested to do so ten days later. Udall did not appear before the Court and judgment was entered for Martyn in Easter Term, 1554.

Depositions taken during the hearing of two cases dealing with liability for repairs to property, in which the plaintiff was the celebrated physician Dr. John Vandernot, show that about 1547 and perhaps later the dramatist—here referred to as "Nycholas Vuedale"—occupied part of a house in the parish of Christ Church within Newgate, in the precincts of the lately dissolved Grey Friars.<sup>2</sup> This point is confirmed by an entry in the London subsidy roll for the ward of Farringdon Within, dated 4 May, 1 Edward VI,<sup>3</sup> where it is recorded that in the parish of Christ Church within Newgate "Maister . . . yevedale" was assessed at five pounds and paid three shillings and fourpence.

H. J. BYROM.

#### A SUGGESTION REGARDING SHAKESPEARE'S MANUSCRIPTS

ANYONE who, in the attempt to prepare a new edition of the plays of Shakespeare, bases his work directly on the earliest printed texts or on those which appear to be most authentic, instead of working backwards from those of his editorial predecessors, will inevitably notice a great difference as regards the character-names in the various plays. In some the names appearing in stage directions and those of the speakers are, allowing perhaps for a few obvious misprints, identical throughout the play; in others the designations of certain characters, not generally the protagonists but persons of secondary importance, vary from time to time. Thus a character who is in one scene indicated by his personal name may in others be called "Father," "Servant," "Merchant" or what not, according

<sup>1</sup> K.B. 27/1170, m. 120. The first hearing was in Trinity Term, 1553; then there was an adjournment till Easter Term, 1554.

<sup>2</sup> P.R.O. Town Depositions, C. 24/30: cases of *Vandernot v. Joan Ayer* and *Vandernot v. Hugh Losse*.

<sup>3</sup> P.R.O. E. 179, 145/151.

to the particular aspect of his personality which is at the moment prominent.

This is, of course, not a new observation, for in certain plays the variation in the names of the characters has been made the basis of arguments for composite authorship, or of theories of the transcription of the MS. or the addition of stage directions, etc., by another hand than that of the author. It seems to me, however, that it may throw a light on the genesis of the MS. used by the printer as copy which has not been fully appreciated.<sup>1</sup>

As examples of the two groups of plays let us take *The Two Gentlemen of Verona* and *The Comedy of Errors*, both of which, so far as is known, made their first appearance in print in the Folio of 1623. If we examine the stage directions and speakers' names of those two plays, we shall find that in the *Two Gentlemen* the names given to the various characters, major or minor, remain constant throughout the play. Thus, for example, Speed is always designated "Speed,"<sup>2</sup> and Launce is always "Launce." They are never described by any periphrasis such as "Proteus' man," "Valentine's servant." Similarly, Antonio is always named; he is not called "Father" even when speaking to his son. To put the matter briefly, the names given to the characters are permanent labels, and are quite unaffected by the function of the character at the moment. This of course accords with the practice followed in printing plays nowadays, whether these are modern or ancient.

When, however, we turn to the *Comedy of Errors* we find a very different state of affairs. The names by which the characters are indicated, instead of being the same throughout, frequently depend, much as they do in a novel,<sup>3</sup> on the progress of the story or on the

<sup>1</sup> So far as I am aware, the point to which I have to call attention has not been appreciated *at all*; but it seems almost impossible to make any statement or put forward any theory about the work of Shakespeare which is not already, somewhere or other, in print! It is in the hope of discovering whether my suggestion is a new one, and, if it is, of obtaining the opinion of others upon it, that I have put together this admittedly incomplete note.

<sup>2</sup> I do not of course mean that there is no variation in the *spelling* of the names, or in the abbreviated forms of them. It is a matter of indifference whether "Speed" appears in full or as "Sp.," "Spe.," etc. In what follows I ignore all such non-significant variations. Simple misprints or errors such as "Panthion" for "Panthino" have also, of course, no significance in this connection.

<sup>3</sup> Thus in a novel concerning one John Smith we might find "said John," "said Mr. Smith," "muttered the bearded stranger," "his father replied," "her husband protested," and so on, when in all cases the words quoted are those of the same John Smith. There is, of course, no ambiguity, for the reader is perfectly aware of the speaker's identity. The change of designation is merely in accordance with the function of the character at the time.

person with whom the character is conversing. Thus the father of the two brothers Antipholus, whom we know from the text to be named Egeon, is in the opening stage-direction described as "*Merchant of Siracusa*," and throughout the first scene is, as a speaker, simply *Merchant*. In the next scene, however, a different merchant (of Ephesus) appears, and later, in iv. i., another. Both these characters are called as speakers simply "*Merchant*" (*Mar.*, *E. Mar.*, *Mer.*). In v. i., however, while this last Merchant is on the stage Egeon enters and recognizes his sons. As his original designation of "*Merchant*" is now in use for someone else, Egeon becomes first "*Merchant Father*" (*Mar. Fat.*) and later simply "*Father*."

Similarly the goldsmith Angelo is called "*Angelo*" at his first entry in iii. i. and again in iii. ii. Later, however, his business as a goldsmith being the chief point of his existence in the play, he is, as a speaker, simply "*Goldsmith*," and so for the rest of the play, his personal name Angelo being dropped.

More significant than either of these, but also more complicated, is the case of the brothers Antipholus and the two Dromios. The first of the four to appear is Antipholus of Syracuse, called at his entrance "*Antipholus Eroides*,"<sup>1</sup> whose name, as a speaker, is abbreviated simply to "*Ant.*," his servant Dromio being "*Dro.*" When, shortly after, the second Dromio enters, this latter is, in order to distinguish the two, called "*Dromio of Ephesus*," abbreviated to "*E. Dro.*"

There is now (ii. ii.) a re-entry of Antipholus of Syracuse, who is still called "*Antipholus Eroides*," his second speech being marked "*E. Ant.*," the later ones simply "*Ant.*" as before; but the first Dromio, returning, is now "*Dromio Siracusia*" (*S. Dro.*). We thus have the confusing arrangement of the master being called "*E. Ant.*" or simply "*Ant.*," while his servant is "*S. Dro.*"

At the beginning of Act III. the other Antipholus enters for the first time. He is "*Antipholus of Ephesus*," abbreviated to "*E. Anti.*" or "*E. An.*," the distinctions of "*E. Dro.*" and "*S. Dro.*" being maintained. When in iii. ii. Antipholus of Syracuse reappears, the confusing "*Antipholus Eroides*" (*E. Ant.*) is dropped and his name is on the first occasion given as "*S. Anti.*" but for the rest of the scene merely "*Ant.*" or "*Anti.*" Similarly in iv. i.

<sup>1</sup> Actually he is here and in some other places called "*Antipholus*." I ignore these minor variations or misprints, as also "*Errotis*" in ii. ii. for "*Eroides*."



his brother, who enters as "*Antipholus Ephes.*" appears in the speech-headings once as "*Eph. Ant.*" but elsewhere as "*Anti.*" or "*Ant.*" From this point onwards the four are consistently distinguished as *E. Ant.*, *S. Ant.*, *E. Dro.*, and *S. Dro.*

To put it briefly, the writer of the MS. evidently marked the distinctions between the two pairs of characters only as and when this became necessary. Further we can see that he had not considered in advance how he could best do this, for having determined to call Dromio of Ephesus "*E. Dro.*" he indicates Antipholus Erotes (the Syracusan, when he needs to distinguish him from his brother, by "*E. Ant.*" Later, however, it becomes obvious that the *E.* and *S.* of the Antipholi should correspond with the *E.* and *S.* of the Dromios, and he calls Antipholus Surreptus (of Ephesus) "*E. Ant.*" and Erotes "*S. Ant.*," dropping in fact the confusing "*Surreptus*" and "*Erotes*" altogether.

Having dealt with the *Comedy of Errors* at some length, we may glance at certain other plays in which a similar treatment of the character names is found.

1. *Romeo and Juliet*. Here in Q2, the earliest print of the accepted text, while there is no uncertainty in the names of the lovers, there is much as regards other characters. Thus Capulet is at first called by his name, "*Cap.*," or when another Capulet is present "*1 Cap.*" When, however, he is engaged in talk with Juliet in III. v. he changes from "*Capulet*" to "*Father*," as he does again in the course of IV. v., becoming again "*Cap.*" in the final scene. Much more remarkable are the variations in the designation of Lady Capulet, who in I. iii. is "*Wife*" or "*Old La.*" in III. i., 151, 181 "*Capu. Wi.*" or "*Ca. Wi.*" in III. iv. "*La.*" in III. v., after "*Enter Mother*," she is "*La.*" for a while, then "*Mo.*" or "*M.*" and later, when Capulet comes in, "*La.*" again. In IV. iv., in a stage direction, she is "*Lady of the house*," in IV. v. again "*Mo.*," returning to "*Wife*" in the final scene. A similar uncertainty is found in IV. v. concerning the Musicians, the author apparently not having decided whether they are musicians or minstrels.<sup>1</sup>

2. *Midsummer Night's Dream*. We find here similar variations in the names. Theseus and Hippolyta are in v. i., during the performance of the play, called "*Duke*" and "*Dutchess (Du., Dut.)*." Titania is sometimes called "*Queen.*"

<sup>1</sup> It will be asked how this compares with Q1, in which, if the text is simply a "report" we should perhaps not expect to find any variation at all. Actually there is some, though much less than in Q2. Capulet, indeed, is "*Cap.*" as a speaker throughout, though we find him in the stage directions described as "*old Capulet*" and sometimes as "*Oldeman.*" Lady Capulet, however, after being "*Wife*" in Acts I and II and entering as "*Capolets wife*" in III. i., becomes as a speaker "*Mother*" (*M.* or *Mo.*) and so remains for the rest of the play.

Bottom is sometimes called "*Clowne*." (The word seems to have been regularly applied to the principal "funny man," and is so used in other plays as an alternative to the personal name.) Puck is sometimes called "Robin Goodfellow" (*Rob.*).

3. *Love's Labour's Lost*. The King of Navarre is called "*Ferdinand*," "*Nauar*" or "*King*."

The Princess of France is thus named at her first entry, but as a speaker first "*Queene*," then "*Princess*" (*Prince*., *Prin.*), then later again (*iv. i.*, etc.) "*Queen*" (*Quee.*).

Armado is sometimes "*Armado*," at others "*Braggart*."

Holophernes sometimes has his proper name, and sometimes is "*the Pedant*" (*Ped.*).

Nathaniel is alternatively "*the Curat*."

Moth is alternatively "*Page*," or "*Boy*."

Costard is alternatively "*Clowne*."

4. *All's Well that Ends Well*. The Countess of Rossillion is variously "*Mother*" (*i. i.*), "*Lady*" (*ii. ii.*, *iii. i.*), "*Countess*," and "*Old Countess*."

Bertram, Count of Rossillion, is "*Ross*." (*ii. i.*, *iii. 9*, *iv.*), and "*Ber*." *ii. iii. 112-183*.

Lafeu is "*Old Lafeu*" (*Ol. Laf.*) in *ii. iii.* ("*Ol. Lord*" used once is probably a mistaken expansion of "*Ol. L.*").

The French Lords at *iii. ii.* become Captains in *iii. vi.*<sup>1</sup>

The "*1 Soldier*" in *iv. i.* becomes "*Interpreter*" (*Inter.*, *Int.*) as soon as he takes on the duties of one, and so remains.

5. *The Merchant of Venice*. There is comparatively little opportunity for variation of names in this play, but the following may be noticed:

Shylock is often called "*Jew*."

Launcelot is often "*Clowne*."

6. *Titus Andronicus*. Saturninus is called "*Emperor*" (*i. i. 299*) and "*King*" (*iv. iv.*, *v. iii.*).

Aron is frequently "*Moore*."

Against these seven examples of plays in which the speakers' names vary we may set seven in which they do not, namely, *The Two Gentlemen of Verona*, *The Taming of the Shrew*, *Measure for Measure*, *Twelfth Night*, *King John*, and *Macbeth*.<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> The curious *E* and *G* added to their names—"French *E*" and "French *G*," "*Cap. E*" and "*Cap. G*," as well as "*1 Lord G*" "*2 Lord E*" earlier have been reasonably explained as indicative of the actors who were to take these parts.

<sup>2</sup> I have chosen what seem to be straightforward and simple examples of the two groups. Others would require discussion or qualification. In some, such as the Roman plays, there is little, if any, scope for variation in the names. It may be noted that in *King John* the Bastard is in his earlier speeches "*Robert*," but as soon as his bastardy is established his name is altered. This has no significance in the present connection, but is parallel to those cases in which a character's style is necessarily changed, as when a pretender to the throne becomes "*King*."

What, then, is the meaning of this difference between regularity and irregularity in the way in which the speakers' names are shown? Simply, I think, that a play in which the names are irregular was printed from the author's original MS.,<sup>1</sup> and that one in which they are regular and uniform is more likely to have been printed from some sort of fair copy, perhaps made by a professional scribe.

It is, I think, generally agreed that the *Two Gentlemen* was printed from such a fair copy. In fact the way in which in this play (and in the Folio *Merry Wives*) all the characters who are to appear in any scene are given at the head of the scene, irrespective of whether they are on the stage when this opens or not, seems to indicate that the copyist was one who was familiar with plays on the classical model, and who deliberately altered the arrangement which he would find in his copy in accordance with the practice in these.<sup>2</sup>

Whether in the case of a transcript of a play intended merely for the study a copyist would, as a matter of course, take pains to normalize the names of the characters, may perhaps be regarded as uncertain, though it seems to me that any competent scribe would probably look on this as part of his duty. But in any case a copy intended for use in the theatre would surely, of necessity, be accurate and unambiguous in the matter of the character-names. A prompter of a repertory theatre could hardly be expected to remember that Bertram was the same person as Rossillion, or Armado the same as Braggart. Such variations would be an intolerable nuisance to him when he suddenly needed to know what actors were on the stage in a particular scene, or to follow the action and be ready to prompt while thinking about something quite different, as one familiar with his job would probably do! It is difficult to imagine a theatrical scribe, at any rate, not attending to a point of this kind.

But on the other hand, consider the *writer*, who is perfectly familiar with his characters as characters, and who from moment to moment sees them in different aspects. Is it not natural that, in

<sup>1</sup> Several of the plays in the "irregular" group are, of course, on other grounds, already generally regarded as printed from the author's MS.

<sup>2</sup> The method is, for example, to be found in such Latin plays as *Hymenæus* and *Fucus Histriomastix*, and in certain English plays on more or less classical lines, such as Brandon's *Vertuous Octavia* (III. i., IV. i.) and Daniel's *Queen's Arcadia* (II. ii.), and in translations such as Gascoigne's *Supposes* (III. i., iv.). In all these, characters are listed at the head of scenes though they do not appear until considerably later.

his first draft at any rate, he should at times follow the practice of the novelist rather than of the person writing a play for the Press, distinguishing his characters just as and when they needed to be distinguished (as in *The Comedy of Errors*), calling them by their functions (Goldsmith, not Angelo; Father, not Capulet) or their peculiarities (Braggart or Pedant, not Armado or Holophernes) just when those functions or peculiarities happened to be uppermost in his mind, knowing perfectly well that the most cursory indications were quite sufficient for his purpose and not troubling himself about any formal consistency? I cannot help thinking that even nowadays in the heat of composition a writer might easily do the like; and it must be remembered that we have cause to suspect that Shakespeare was not any too careful of minor details.

But if there is anything in this view, if we can with some confidence assert that a play showing, in the character names, irregularity of the kind which I have described, was printed directly from the author's MS., the fact seems to be of considerable importance, for such plays must necessarily be regarded for purposes of textual criticism very differently from those which we can suppose to derive from a fair copy made by someone else. In the one case we must allow for confused corrections and careless writing, but can take it for granted that the compositor had before him something which, though perhaps difficult to decipher, embodied the intention of the author, and that the text as we have it must represent fairly closely what the MS. *looked like* to the compositor. In the other case the compositor would presumably be working from a MS. which would in itself be easily legible, but the text of which might already have been tampered with by someone who had views as to what the author ought to have written, and who placed the construction of a readable text above the duty of following closely the *ductus litterarum* of his original. The kinds of error which we should expect to find in prints from MSS. of the two groups may evidently be very different.

R. B. McKERROW.

NEW POEMS BY SIR EDWARD DYER<sup>1</sup>

"I have not seen much of Sir Edward Dyers Poetry," wrote Edmund Bolton in his *Hypercritica* in the early seventeenth century; and in 1872 Grosart was able to collect only twelve pieces for his edition. A single addition has since been made: the verses beginning "The lowest trees have tops, the ant her gall," in Davison's *Poetical Rhapsody* (ed. Rollins, i. 186).<sup>2</sup> Grosart, however, was unable to find two poems used by the author of *The Arte of English Poesie* (1589) to illustrate various poetical figures of speech. These two poems, and one other, may now be restored to the small corpus of Dyer's lyrics from an Elizabethan poetical miscellany, MS. Harley 7392 (article 2) in the British Museum.<sup>3</sup> The first two poems continue the strains of "He that his mirth hath lost," and do not represent to modern ears Dyer's best music; but there is little doubt that these "grammatical laments" were as much admired by

<sup>1</sup> Ralph M. Sargent in *At the Court of Queen Elizabeth: The Life and Lyrics of Sir Edward Dyer* (1935), which appeared after this note was written, has not noticed the poems printed below. To Grosart's twelve poems he has added three: "The lowest trees have tops," an anonymous elegy on Sidney in *The Phoenix Nest*, and the poem mentioned in note 2, p. 471, below. However, the latter is printed not from the Folger MS., which is not referred to, but from a transcript of it, wherein apparently the signature had not been deleted.

<sup>2</sup> Signed "Sir [corrected from Mr] Edward DIER" in MS. Rawl. poet. 148 (John Lilliat's MS.), fol. 103v. Two other copies may be added to the list in Rollins: Inner Temple Library, MS. Petyt 538, vol. 10, fol. 3v, and MS. 2071. 1, fol. 198v, in the Folger Shakespeare Library. It should be noted that the verses "Amidst the fayrest mountayne topps," printed by Grosart, and lately by Sir E. K. Chambers in *The Oxford Book of Sixteenth Century Verse* (1932) as from a MS. "now unknown," are in the same MS., fols. 65-66. Here the signature "qd Mr Dier" is Lilliat's correction of his first attribution of the poem to "ye Earle Essex. Vel L: Mountioy." It was first printed, probably by Philip Bliss, in *The Oxford University and City Herald*, July 4, 1812.

<sup>3</sup> Professor Rollins kindly referred me to this MS. This important collection of poems is, with two or three exceptions, in the autograph of the antiquary St. Lo Knyveton of Gray's Inn (died 1628), whose signature it bears (fols. 11, 61. Cp., among other MSS. in the British Museum and the Bodleian, MS. Add. 5861, fols. 187v-200). From the character of the handwriting it would appear to date from his early years at Gray's Inn, which he entered on 29 May, 1584 (Foster, *Register*, 65). At the end of the MS. (fols. 77-8) six poems are added in a different hand which, judging from the penning of the signatures, are very probably in the autograph of Robert Allott, the compiler of *Wits Theater of the little World* (1599) and *Englands Parnassus* (1600). The pieces are signed "Robert Allott," "R Allott" (two poems), "R A," "Incerti Authoris"; a couplet is unsigned. From this it may be inferred either that Allott as a friend of Knyveton's was asked to write some of his own verses in the book, or that Allott subsequently acquired the volume; in any case it suggests the possibility that Knyveton may have known him as a fellow student at one of the Inns of Court. A Robert Allott who fits these circumstances perfectly is the one thus listed by Foster in *Alumni Oxonienses*: "Allott, Robert (Allatte), of co. Lincoln, gent. Corpus Christi Coll., matric. entry under date (circa 1581), aged 18; of Driby, co. Lincoln, admitted to the Inner Temple 1584. See *D.N.B.* . . ." It would seem most likely that this is the literary man (as Foster's reference to the *D.N.B.* would suggest). The name of another possible acquaintance of Knyveton's appears on the cover (fol. 11), namely "Humfrey Conynsby," who may be the student who matriculated at Christ Church in November, 1581, and was M.P. for St. Alban's in 1584-5, and later.

his contemporaries as his other pieces, and were largely the basis for the statement in *The Arte of English Poesie* that "Maister Edward Dyar" was well known "for Elegie most sweete, solempne, and of high conceit."

## I

Before I dy, faire dame of me, receive my last adiew.

Accounte my helpelesse grief no Iest, for time shall prove it trew.

My Teares were signes of Sorowes fytted for all my former care,

When yet my woes wer very yong, but now so great they are.

As all my store consumed quite, y<sup>e</sup> only eyes remayne, [5]

W<sup>ch</sup> turninge vp their sight to heven, lamente their m<sup>n</sup> paine.

W<sup>th</sup> gastly staring lookes, even such as may my Death fortell,

The only meane for me poore Soule, to shunne an earthly Hell.

But now my Deare, for so my love doth make me call thee still,

That Love I say, that luckles love, w<sup>ch</sup> workes mee all this yll, [10]

This ill wherof sweete Soule, thou art at all no cause,

Both Hand & Hart w<sup>th</sup> francke consent, acquytes thee of the lawes.

Thou knowste in tender yeeres, before my pryme awchyle,

Cupid at the sight of thee, my sences did beguyle.

It was a World of Ioyes, for me, to live w<sup>th</sup>in thy sighte, [15]

Thy Sacred p<sup>s</sup>ence vnto me did giue so greates delighte.

It was a Heaven to me to view thy face Devine,

Wherin besides Dame Venus, stayne, great Maiesty did shine.

These things like folishe singed fflye, at first made me my game,

Tyll time and riper yeares, cam on, my woes to frame. [20]

ffor at the last I felt it worke, and did bethinke me how,

Vnproved yet my mystres wold, her servantes Love allow.

Thus long in this Concept I livde, and durst it not bewray,

Wherby, both former Mirth, & Strengthe, & Health did soone decay.

Thy self didste seme w<sup>th</sup> gracious Eye, to pittie my Dystres, [25]

The cause vnknown; yet was I far from hope of all redres.

ffor like the Silly Lambe, that makes no noyse vntill he Dies,

Even so I secret kept my tongue, but told it w<sup>th</sup> my eyes.

yet this I counted for a Toy, as longe as I myght bee,

Without suspect of Ielouse heades, in company of thee. [30]

But when thy choyse was made, & ffortune framde it so,

As neyther I, nor yow nor Hee, but did endure sō wo,

Then did my Ioyes take end, suche force hathe Ielousy

That both their owne & others to; my harms they wrought therby.



Well, this is all my Sute, w<sup>ch</sup> thou in no case canste deny, [35]  
 When turninge time shall end my dayes, by fatall destiny,  
 Which now by open signes I find, comes roundely towards mee,  
 This recompence for all my paynes, I do require of thee.  
 Vouchsafe to visit for my sake, my everlastinge Grave,  
 Stay ther vntill my latest rites, y<sup>e</sup> Priest performed have. [40]  
 Thus Charity comāudes; but somthing yet ther comēs behinde,  
 Which if thou grañteste to performe, will argue y<sup>ee</sup> more kind.  
 Eache yeare vpon the blessed day, wherein my lyfe toke end,  
 Vnto my Tombe repaire, wher I thy comīng will attend.  
 Good mystres there confesse, my rare renowned Love, [45]  
 The Loyall Hart I bare, w<sup>ch</sup> Deathe could not remove.  
 And when thou hast don this, then tell the world frō me,  
 My suyte at no Time did exceed, the Bandes of Modesty.  
 Of on thing yet beware, sighe &, nor shead no Teare,  
 Leste that my Tormentes do renew, when I thy Sorrowes heare. [50]  
 fynys. DY.

1 *Before*] preceded by 9, the number of the poem in the MS.  
 10 *luckles*] *linckles* 14 *did*] *did* [1] 25 *dystres*] *y* altered from *i* 27 *no*  
 interlined 30 *of*<sup>2</sup>] *w<sup>th</sup>*; *of* in margin 47 *then*] *then* [*ther*] 49 &] *not*;  
 & in margin.

Fols. 22<sup>v</sup>-23. See *The Arte of English Poesie*, ed. Arber, p. 180. "Your first figure of tollerable disorder is [*Parenthesis*] or by an English name the [*Insertour*] and is when ye will seeme for larger information or some other purpose, to peece or graffe in the midst of your tale an vnecessary parcell of speech, which neuerthelesse may be thence without any detriment to the rest. The figure is so common that it needeth noe example, neuerthelesse because we are to teache Ladies and Gentlewomen to know their schoole points and termes appertaining to the Art, we may not refuse to yeeld examples euen in the plainest cases, as that of maister *Diars* very aptly.

*But now my Deere (for so my loue makes me to call you still)  
 That loue I say, that lucklesse loue, that works me all this ill."*

## II

But this and then no more, it is my laste and all,  
 And for each word y<sup>t</sup> I did write, a brackish tear did fall.  
 Not that I hope for Grace, I do these lines endighte,  
 ffor well I know the ffates themselues, at such my fortune spighte.

[35] But sith my faith, my hope, my love, & trew intende, [5]  
 My liberty, my *service* vowd, my time, and all is spente,  
 Sith y<sup>t</sup> all these I say, I see ar lost in vayne,  
 To lose the latter lynes w<sup>th</sup>all, I count it little payne,  
 And yet if yow but read, & view them w<sup>th</sup> your Eye  
 I never shall account them lost, though nought I gaine therby. [10]  
 But if you thinke I meane, to move y<sup>r</sup> mind to ruthe  
 By this cōparynge my hard hap, w<sup>th</sup> my approved truthe,  
 You do my wordes mystake, no such intende I have,  
 ffor to redresse my cureles harmes, I know not w<sup>t</sup> to crave  
 My griefes ar to far growen, my woundes ar gon to deepe, [15]  
 And y<sup>r</sup> disdaine w<sup>th</sup> my dispayres, to nere my hart do creepe.  
 I am not as I was, when first I lovde your fface,  
 My sprighthes, w<sup>ch</sup> then swam in delightes, ar now sunke in  
 disgrace.  
 Nor Love hath now the force, w<sup>ch</sup> once of me it had,  
 Y<sup>r</sup> frownes can neither make me morne, nor favor make me  
 glad. [20]  
 Not that I have more power, to governe my desyre,  
 But y<sup>t</sup> I only am indeede, as Ashes lefte of ffyre.  
 Yet hate I not the Wyghte, the Causer of y<sup>e</sup> same,  
 Nor ever will : but w<sup>th</sup> regard, & Honor vse her name.  
 Though for her sake I vow, & will the same approve, [25]  
 She was y<sup>e</sup> first, & is the last, that ay my Hart shall love.  
 All yow w<sup>ch</sup> reade these lynes, & scan of my Desarte,  
 Gyve Iudgement, whether was more hard, my hap, or els her  
 Harte.  
 And as for yow, ffayr One, say now by *profe* yow fynde  
 That RIGOR & INGRATITUDE, SOONE KYL A GENTLE  
 MYNDE. [30]

FYNIS. G.O.R.

1 *But*] preceded by 21 the number of the poem in the MS. 24 *ever*] *never*; *ever* in margin 26 *She*] *She* [*is*] 27 *desarte*] *a* altered from *e*  
 31 *G.O.R.*] the points before and after *O* may have been added later.

Fols. 27<sup>v</sup>-28. *The Arte of English Poesie* quotes thrice from the poem (pp. 244, 219, 235, 245), twice assigning the authorship to Dyer, and, in agreement with the MS., once to "Maister Gorge," presumably Sir Arthur Gorges, the relative of Raleigh and the friend of Spenser. The verses, however, should be included—if only temporarily—among the works of Dyer. As an illustration of "Sinathrismus, or the Heaping figure:" "And thus by Maister Edward Diar, vehement swift and passionately

*But if my faith my hope, my loue my true intent,  
My libertie, my seruice vowed, my time and all be spent,  
In vaine, &c."*

"Anachinosis, or the Impartener:" "Maister Gorge, in this figure, said very sweetly.

*All you who read these lines and skanne of my desart,  
Iudge whether was more good, my hap or els my hart."*

"Antitheton, or The renconter:" "Maister Diar in this quarrelling figure.

*Nor loue hath now the force, on me which it ones had,  
Your frownes can neither make me mourne, nor fauors make me glad."*

"Apostrophe, or the turne tale:" "Many times when we haue runne a long race in our tale spoken to the hearers, we do sodainly flye out and either speake or exclaime at some other person or thing, and therefore the Greekes call such figure (as we do) the turnway or turnetale, and breedeth by such exchange a certaine recreation to the hearers minds, as this vsed by a louer to his vnkind mistresse.

*And as for you (faire one) say now by proofe ye finde,  
That rigour and ingratitude soone kill a gentle minde."*

### III

fancy farwell, that fed my fond delight,  
Delight adew, the cause of my distresse,  
Distresse adew that dost me such despight,  
Despite adew, for death dothe lend redresse.  
And death adew, for though I thus be slayne, [5]  
In thy despite I hope to live agayne.

Sweet Hart farwell, whose love hath wrought my wo,  
And farwell wo, that veried hast my wittes,  
And farewell wit, w<sup>ch</sup> will bewitched so,  
And farwell will, o full of franticke fittes. [10]  
ffranzy farwell whose force I fele to sore,  
And farwell feeling, for I feele no more.

And lyef adew, that I have lyvd and loathd  
And farewell Love, that makest me loth my lyfe,  
Both love and lyfe farwell vnto yow both, [15]  
Twixt hope and dread, farwell all folishe strife.  
ffolly farewell w<sup>ch</sup> I have fancied so,  
And farwell fancy, that first wrought my wo.

FINIS. Dyer.

<sup>1</sup> *ffancy*] preceded by 83, the number of the poem in the MS.  
<sup>2-3</sup> *distresse*] *desires*; *distresse* Harl. 6910 <sup>4</sup> *lend*] *send* Harl. 6910  
<sup>13</sup> *feeling*] followed by a second comma. <sup>21</sup> *Dyer*] preceded by *HO*.  
 deleted; the alteration was made by the same hand at a later time.

Fol. 51<sup>v</sup>. In MS. Harl. 6910, fol. 172<sup>v</sup>, is an anonymous poem consisting of the following stanza followed by the first four lines of the present piece.

Cease Sorrowes now for thou hast don thy deed  
 Lo care hath now consum'd my carcase quite  
 No hope can helpe. nor helpe can stand in stead  
 ffor dolefull death doth cut of my delight  
 Yet whilst I heare the tolling of the bell  
 Before I dye I singe this Last farewell.

There are two other poems attributed to Dyer. The first, "ffayne would I but I dare not," is ascribed to Sir Walter Raleigh in a single manuscript, and Miss Latham in printing it (*Raleigh*, p. 171) notes that "Raleigh's claim is slight." An unnoted copy in MS. Harl. 7392 fol. 22<sup>v</sup> gives the poem to Dyer.<sup>1</sup> The second is an allegorical poem entitled "Loue compared to a Tennis playe," and begins "Wheras y<sup>e</sup> Harte at Tennyssye playes, & mē to gaminge fall." Of the six copies of this piece, three are anonymous (MS. Rawl. poet. 85, fol. 106; MS. Add. 19269, fols. 202<sup>v</sup>-203; Cotgrave, *Wits Interpreter*, 1655, sig. O4<sup>r-v</sup>), two ascribe it to the Earl of Oxford (Harl. 7392, fol. 35; Marsh's Library, Dublin, MS. Z3.5.21, fol. 20), and one to "s<sup>r</sup> E : D : " (Morgan Library, Holgate MS., page 134). I believe the poem to be Edward de Vere's.<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> H. H. Hudson omits to mention this fact in his "Notes on the Raleigh Canon," *M.L.N.*, xlv. (1931), pp. 386-389.

<sup>2</sup> In the "Cornwallis" MS. (MS. 1. 112), page 22, in the Folger Shakespeare Library, is a poem the ascription of which to "Dier" has been deleted. It begins:

wher one woulde be ther not to be  
 what is a greater payne  
 or what more grieve ther not to be  
 wher thou wouldest be full fayne.

BERNARD M. WAGNER.

## REVIEWS

**Thomas More.** By R. W. CHAMBERS. London : Jonathan Cape, Ltd. 1935. Pp. 416. 12s. 6d. net.

FOR years Professor Chambers has been lecturing and writing upon Sir Thomas More, and now in definitive form he has given us the mature fruits of his long studies. The chief sources for More's life have always been the early biographies, his own works, and the correspondence of Erasmus ; but the present biography, besides working these sources thoroughly and systematically, has elucidated many points by reference to State Papers, contemporary writings and events. Thus the Professor does not hesitate to modify his previous opinion as to the date of More's birth, and now considers February 6, 1478, the correct date. Again he has found, in a sermon of Cardinal Pole's, important evidence, hitherto neglected by More's biographers, upon More's change of opinion upon the foundation of the primacy of the Pope. Other points that we do not think have been before noted are the reference of the story of the offending virgin to a passage in Tacitus concerning the daughter of Sejanus, and the fact that some of the prayers printed by Rastell as the composition of More in the Tower were in reality written by his daughter Margaret Roper.

More's public work, at home and abroad, here receives a fuller treatment than is usual in his biographies, and in general the book is a delight to read on account of the author's wide literary and historical knowledge and the illuminating comparisons it enables him to make. Persuasively though he writes, there will necessarily be points of detail where he will fail to convince every reader. For example, he is more tender than we should be to Henry's alleged conscientious scruples about his first marriage.

Since Father Bridgett published in 1891 his great work of rehabilitation, *Life and Writings of Blessed Thomas More*, the graver charges of cruelty and conscious insincerity have not been so commonly levelled against Henry VIII's chancellor. Yet still to

many people he is frankly a puzzle, or, as a recent writer puts it, "a bundle of antitheses." Professor Chambers sets out to demonstrate the essential consistency of More's life and does so, in our opinion, with entire success. The battle turns largely upon the true significance of the *Utopia*. To understand it as a revolt against the authority of the Church's official teaching is quite unjustifiable: it is steeped in mediæval conceptions. The Utopians are sacerdotalists; their priests wear symbolic vestments, officiate in dim, mysterious churches, and are immune from the civil jurisdiction. The mode of life practised in the island seems to be the fanciful extension to an entire community of the life of a religious house. More himself, in a letter to Erasmus, calls the uniform the citizens wear "*paludamentum Franciscanum*." The opinions they hold upon divorce, suicide, etc., are accounted for by the condition that More expressly lays down, viz. that they are pagans, have not the light of revelation to guide them, but only the twilight of natural reason. That "More turned his back on the ennobling enthusiasms of his youth" (Principal Lindsay) is a statement entirely without just foundation. From those early days when he dreamed of the religious life and practised severe bodily austerities until his imprisonment, with its religious exercises, its devotional writings, its beautiful and touching letters to Margaret Roper, his life is all of one piece. He devoted himself to the service of Henry VIII and the State, but preserved his independence and purity of conscience. In his own words, spoken on the scaffold, he had been ever "the king's good servant, but God's first."

The martyr by his death protests against the supposition that might is right and that God is always on the side of the big battalions. He must be ready to be condemned by the dominant public opinion of the moment, confident in ultimate justification. Such a justification has now been accorded to St. Thomas More in his canonization by the Church for which he died. It can hardly be expected that all those who are not members of that communion should endorse the Church's verdict. Whilst Professor Chambers' loving reverence for More, as a noble martyr for the truth in which he sincerely believed, will be shared by many, there will always be others to whom the sacrifice of earthly comforts and defiance of popular opinion for the sake of fidelity to an ideal will be accounted obstinacy, spiritual pride, eccentricity, or folly. Dame Alice represents this commonsense view, and the schoolboy, quoted by



Professor Chambers, who thought that she was the only sensible person of the lot.

The matter goes down into deep spiritual issues and beyond present argument. But among the "witnesses to the unseen," to use Wilfrid Ward's phrase, there are few more persuasive and attractive than the wise, witty, affectionate, and merry Thomas More.

P. E. HALLETT.

**The Classic Deities in Bacon : A Study in Mythological Symbolism.** By C. W. LEMMI. Baltimore : Johns Hopkins Press ; London : Humphrey Milford. 1933. Pp. x+224. \$2.50 ; 12s. 6d. net.

PROFESSOR LEMMI'S most interesting book is a study of Bacon's position as the successor of a series of writers on classical mythology, beginning with Boccaccio [*De genealogiis deorum*, ptd. 1472], and passing down through Giraldi [*Historia de diis gentium*, 1548], Natale Conti [*Mythologiae*, 1556], and Cartari [*Imagini degli dei degli antichi*, 1556], all of whose works appeared in several editions before 1600. They attempted "to interpret the myths, and to restore to them the recondite meanings which the ancients attached to them." Other interpreters, great and small, lead to Bacon. What view the great philosopher took of mythology and of the allegorical interpretation of poetry is the subject of these pages. Did the *De Veterum Sapientia* sound, as Spingarn claimed, "the death-knell of this mode of interpreting literature"? a judgment paralleled by another modern writer, who says that "a good deal of it seems to be original." Professor Lemmi's detailed study, which begins after a preliminary warning that even the latter cautious estimate goes too far, leads him to the conclusion that Bacon's symbolism is not original, that the great Renaissance philosopher remains essentially mediæval, his desire to deduce from observed fact being more than equalled by his impulse to deduce from authority. "One is tempted," says Professor Lemmi, "to call him a mediæval Philosopher haunted by a modern dream."

Bacon is, indeed, remarkable for the constant use of mythological symbolism in his prose works, and in answer to those who have asserted his indifference to literature, Professor Lemmi expresses

the view that the one who approaches most nearly to him as a symbolist is Spenser, a poet. Bacon, in short, had more than the "unimaginative accuracy" of the scientist: he had a vision of "scientific enlightenment." "*The Wisdom of the Ancients* is not the *Faerie Queene*, but we shall not understand it if we think of it as something very different," is Professor Lemmi's closing remark.

Professor Lemmi's examination of Bacon's originals is excellently carried out, and it is a pity that his volume is marred by a wholly inadequate index, from which a number of important names, apart from a large number of page references, are missing. I note some misspellings: p. 34, pluchra; p. 71, Broccaccio; p. 109, laberynthine; p. 216, Baccaccio; p. 216, Du Bartas, *Sepmaine on création du monde*; p. 217, Guy, H., *poesie*. On p. 8, first quotation, Montaigne's prose has been printed as a kind of very blank verse.

DOUGLAS HAMER.

**Elizabethan Book-Pirates.** By CYRIL BATHURST JUDGE. Cambridge (Mass.): Harvard University Press; London: Humphrey Milford. 1934. Pp. xiv+198. \$2.50; 10s. 6d. net.

ALTHOUGH none of the matters discussed in this book are new to students of Elizabethan printing, Mr. Judge by his diligent use of all sources of information has been able to throw a good deal of fresh light on them, especially as regards details of legal procedure, and it is useful to have the several cases now presented in a manner as full as we can reasonably look forward to. It is, of course, true that the evidence is not always complete, and it happens only too often that after elaborate legal pleadings the final issue is in doubt. This is naturally galling to the investigator, but it appears to be a common, if not the usual, fate of Elizabethan law-suits, and since we can never be sure that the available evidence is either trustworthy or complete, I hardly think that much is to be gained by putting the defendants once more on trial and attempting "an informal judgment of their guilt or innocence", as the author does on p. 73.

After a couple of introductory chapters sketching the various attempts made to regulate the book trade from the time of Caxton to the death of Elizabeth, Mr. Judge discusses at length four

important affairs : namely, the revolt led by John Wolf and continued by Roger Ward against the holders of privileges, the pirating of the Days' ABC's and Accidences, Waldegrave's career and his association with the Martinist books and the *Arcadia*, and the translation of Simon Stafford from the Drapers' to the Stationers' Company. It is of course possible that further documents bearing upon these cases may yet come to light, but for the present the author appears to have exhausted the available sources, and his thorough use of the material deserves full credit. Those unfamiliar with Elizabethan depositions may gain an idea of some of the difficulties of the task by studying the facsimiles at pages 70 and 128.

Little would be gained by once more going over ground that in its general contours is already familiar, and it would therefore seem more profitable to consider a few points of detail in Mr. Judge's treatment of his cases.

In passing I may express a little surprise at the remark that graphic description is "a feature not often present in Elizabethan legal documents" (p. 120). My own experience of such documents is limited, but I should have thought that vivid touches of the sort were rather characteristic of bills and depositions at that time. Perhaps the phrase was used thoughtlessly, for Mr. Judge is occasionally unhappy in his expressions : for instance the astonishing statement that by custom of the City "a freeman might engage in any occupation other than that to which he was brought up" (p. 112) ! Picturesque phrases are always a trap, and when we read (p. 50) that "no amount of pressure could make Ward divulge" the names of his partners, it is pertinent to observe that we have no means of knowing either what pressure was brought to bear on him or how much he was willing to endure. All we have are his answers to interrogatories. And I doubt whether the term "cross-examination" can be correctly applied to the administration of interrogatories (as on p. 51), though it is true that Arber so uses it incidentally. Also I much question whether "Ordinarily the lightest wish of the archbishop would have been law to the Stationers' Company" (p. 121).

There are scattered phrases and remarks that seem to me to suggest some misapprehension concerning the position and affairs of the Company. Take the surrender of privileges on January 8, 1584. This, we are told, shows that "the Stationers' Company made an honest effort to relieve the poverty of the poorer members

of their craft" and "that the company had the interest of all its members at heart." "After all," adds Mr. Judge, "the patents had been purchased, one must suppose, at a fair market price, and the assignment of them to unprivileged members represented a worthy act on the part of the patentees" (pp. 52-3). What the surrender shows, with respect to the patent-holders, is that they were willing to make some sacrifice for the sake of peace, but the holders were not the Company, nor the Company the holders, and as to the attitude of the Company it shows just nothing at all. Moreover there was no assignment to unprivileged members. It would have been absurd to make sacrifices in order merely to create a fresh class of privileged individuals. What the holders did was so far to relinquish their patents as to yield up certain books into the hands and disposition of the Court of the Company to be used at its discretion for the relief of the poor, and even so most of the books given up were not privilege books at all but ordinary copyrights. A "fair market price" for the grant of a royal patent is a phrase to which it is difficult to assign an exact meaning.

Then there is the question of "licence" (p. 23). There is no doubt that from first to last the Company, usually acting through one of the Wardens, assumed the responsibility of allowing uncontroversial books to be entered, and therefore to be printed, without formal authorization from an official source. But it is a mistake to suppose that the Company or Warden therefore "licensed" books in any technical sense. Mr. Judge writes that the Company "gradually became the unofficial licensing authority for the ordinary run of books", and he cites in evidence the use of the term "licence" in the entries themselves. But the very entries that he quotes refute his inference. They are:

Receaved of Thomas purfoote for his lycense for pryntinge of a boke intituled *the Castell of Love* . . . . . vjd

Receved of Thomas marshe for his lycense for pryntinge of *a breaffe cronenacle* made by John Stowe auctorysshed by my lorde of Canterbury / . . . . . vjd

Here it is evident that the "licence" is quite distinct from the "authorization" and means no more than the entry in the Hall-Book; it corresponds to the registration of the "copy," according to the formula later adopted.

Again there appears to me to be confusion in the interpretation of the term "disorderly." On p. 60 we read: "Certainly [Ward]

was not a finished printer—the records often mention his disorderly work ”; while on p. 71 it is more specifically noted: “By the term ‘disorderly printing’ we must understand books carelessly or incorrectly printed, as well as those printed contrary to privilege.” Of course, the term does not only mean contrary to privilege: it means contrary to the orders or custom of the craft or to official regulations. I recall no evidence of its use to mean bad printing.

I cannot conceive what ground Mr. Judge has for supposing (p. 25) that “the establishment of close censorship was undoubtedly bad for the printing-trade in that it stifled free competition”: the two matters appear to be wholly unconnected. But perhaps economics is not his strong point, for the terms “community printing” and “coöperative enterprise” are wholly inapplicable to Robinson’s proposal to abolish monopoly discussed on p. 82, and there is a questionable note at the foot of the following page.

It is necessary to protest strongly against the statement (p. 135) that when on February 6, 1594, Danter entered *Titus Andronicus* in the Register he was “thereby burdening himself with a new phase of piracy.” Danter’s reputation was bad enough, but in this instance there is not the slightest evidence of anything piratical about the publication. The entry is perfectly regular and the text quite reasonably sound. It is true that the Folio contains one scene not in the Quarto, but whether this was added or restored is uncertain. It is also true that after Danter’s death the copy was claimed by both the booksellers concerned in the original publication in 1594, but this has no bearing upon the character of that publication.

In the foregoing instances I think that Mr. Judge has in one way or another misconceived the evidence. I add below a few miscellaneous jottings.

Page 57. On the date “2. m’cij 1590” appears the note: “I.e., new style, 1591.” But the corresponding “new style” date would be 12 March 1591.

Page 58. A chase is defined as “A frame for holding composed type for page or sheet.” It holds neither a page nor a sheet but a forme.

Page 133. The “London County Council” is surely an anachronism in Elizabeth’s reign! Evidently the Common Council is meant.

Lastly on page 124 a curious question is raised as to the meaning of "damaske paper." The old suggestion quoted from *N. & Q.* to the effect that to "damask" paper was to *démasquer*, unmask or change its appearance, can hardly be entertained. I imagine that damask paper is patterned or diaper paper: *domino* paper is the French term. It was printed over with some design in black or colour and used for lining boxes and the like. (See an important paper by Hilary Jenkinson on "English Wall-Papers of the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries" in *The Antiquaries' Journal* for July 1925, v. 238-53.) If so, to damask paper was to impress such a pattern upon it, and confiscated sheets were overprinted in that manner to deface them and then used as waste.

W. W. GREG.

**A Critical Bibliography of the Works of Edmund Spenser printed before 1700.** By F. R. JOHNSON. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press; London: Humphrey Milford. 1933, 1934. Pp. xiv+61. \$2.75; 12s. 6d. net.

A FULL bibliography of Spenser has long been necessary, and the present work, which goes down to 1700, offers us the most important material. This thin volume is independent of the Johns Hopkins *Variorum Spenser*, but has been issued in the same type, paper, format, and binding as a companion volume. The arrangement of the matter, by which all editions of a work are noted in succession, leaves something to be desired, since it obscures chronology of interest. An index to the descriptions would have been useful, since one is apt to forget that *The Shepherds Calender* of 1597 is here recorded before the publications of 1590 to 1596. The bibliographical descriptions are accurate, and are supported by facsimiles of the title-pages of the first editions. Two facsimiles appear to be slightly defective, and thus do not agree with the descriptions. These are the facsimiles of *The Shepheardes Calender* and the *Prothalamion*, where the hyphens at the ends of two lines of the titles have been lopped off, perhaps in preparing the plates. I also think that it would have been better to have recorded the title-pages of the *Complaints* volume, and of the *Three Proper, and wittie, familiar Letters*, in full.

The records of *The Shepheardes Calender* close with a description



of the 1653 edition, which presented an English text of the poem, and the Latin translation of Theodore Bathurst, the *Calendarium Pastorale*. Mr. Johnson rightly notes that the English text follows the 1597 quarto and the 1611-17 folio in omitting one stanza from the June Eclogue, beginning "Nowe dead he is, and lyeth wrapt in lead." The Latin version also omits this stanza, thus proving that Bathurst used either the 1597 quarto or the 1611-17 folio. While noting that the missing stanza was restored to the text by Hughes in 1715, Mr. Johnson omits to mention that Hughes also reprinted Bathurst's translation in vol. vi., and that he restored the missing stanza to the Latin text. As Hughes says nothing about these peculiarities in either text he must have used an early edition of the English poem, but where did he get a complete version of Bathurst's translation from? It would, of course, be easy to reply that Hughes had himself inserted the stanza, but it may have been done earlier.

Mr. Johnson, however, has not traced the history of the translation. He notes that there are several MSS., which he does not list. Some, if not all, are peculiar in having been written in several hands, and Mr. Johnson remarks that this "would suggest the possibility that this Latin version was the product of a sort of academic exercise at Cambridge in which several persons took part." The deduction is, I think, not justifiable, though I admit that it is a possible one. An equally likely one is that people anxious to have copies of the translation employed friends to copy out different parts of the poem at the same time. Mr. Johnson overlooks the evidence of William Dillingham, who in 1653, the year of the printed edition, of which he was the editor, became Master of Emmanuel, and later Vice-Chancellor of Cambridge, and thus one whose evidence is not to be lightly passed over. Dillingham says that he obtained two copies of the translation at the sale of Bathurst's library (Bathurst had died in 1651), and that he satisfied himself, on looking it over, that it was the work of one man only and worthy of publication. Dillingham had clearly not heard of the translation before the sale of Bathurst's books, as he must have done, being a Latin scholar and poet, had it been an academic exercise. Dillingham stresses the extreme shyness of Bathurst as a reason for the translation not being more generally known. This, of course, does not account for the existence of other seventeenth-century manuscripts.

Mr. Johnson does not mention a still earlier Latin translation of the poem, done into hexameters by a scholar of Christ Church College, Oxford, named John Dove, who took his B.A. in 1583, M.A. 1586, B.D. 1593, and D.D. 1596, after which he became rector of St. Mary Aldermary, London. The translation was done during the later years of his residence at Oxford. This translation, of which there appears to be only one copy, entitled *Poimenologia, quæ vulgo calendarium Pastorum appellatur e versu Anglicano in Latinum traducta*, was presented to Gonville and Caius College, Cambridge, by William Moore (1590-1659), a graduate of the college and donor of books, and later University Librarian. Mr. Johnson should also have noted two later editions of Bathurst's *Calendarium*, published by John Ball, one without date, the other in 1732.

The notes to the *Complaints* volume endeavour to discuss the order in which the items composing it, each bearing a separate title-page, were printed off. I have nothing against Mr. Johnson's conclusions that the poems were printed in the order in which they appear, despite the fact that the first three are dated 1591 and the last 1590. But I think he offers a poor explanation of the different lay-out of the title of the first poem: "The crowding of the line 'London' down close to the following line in (1) was the consequence of the large amount of printed matter set above it in the compartment. In (2), (3), and (4) there was no need for crowding." It was not the large amount of matter in the title, so much as the way in which it was spread out. The *Complaints* title contains, including "By Ed. Sp.," eighteen words, which are spread over nine lines; the *Prosopopoia* title, author's initials, and dedication, contain eighteen words spread over seven lines; the *Muiopotmos* title, initials, and dedication contain twenty-one words, which cover only seven lines. So that it was not excess of matter which caused the compositor of the first title-page to spread himself out. He may have thought that the first title-page required to be distinguished from the succeeding title-pages, but only achieved ugliness.

Mr. Johnson also errs, I think, in stating that the line "By Ed. Sp." was reset for the *Prosopopoia* and *Muiopotmos* title-pages. It was simply pushed up higher on the page, to bring it to its normal position between the titles and the dedications. In so doing a space was inserted between "Ed." and "Sp." The first stage of the moving up already appears on the title-page of *The Teares of the Muses*, where there was no dedication. The decorative four

hands pointing inwards, which were also moved up, remained in this new position for the third and fourth poems in the volume. It also seems to me that the line "London," which had been raised for the second poem, was raised still a little more for the third and fourth.

Mr. Johnson omits from the notes to the description of *Axiochus* the reference to that work in Steevens's edition of Shakespeare (1773), I. E8<sup>b</sup>, "Axiochus, a Dialogue, attributed to Plato, by Edw. Spenser, 4<sup>to</sup>, 1592," from which Herbert borrowed the entry, and in particular the statement of size, which appears in his edition of Ames's *Typographical Antiquities*. For this reference I am indebted to Professor Padelford's edition of the *Axiochus*.

In spite of these debateable issues, none of which is in the least serious, Mr. Johnson's work is excellent. The handling of the complications of the 1611-17 folio is masterly.

DOUGLAS HAMER.

**Art and Artifice in Shakespeare: A Study in Dramatic Contrast and Illusion.** By E. E. STOLL. Cambridge University Press. 1933. Pp. xvi+178. 7s. 6d. net.

THE work of Professor Stoll has long been a stimulant (if not at times an irritant) in Shakespearian scholarship and criticism. He was one of the first of modern scholars to insist that Shakespeare's plays were written not for all time but for the Elizabethan stage: and especially in his study of *Hamlet* he demonstrated that when the play is considered as an Elizabethan drama of revenge most of the critical problems cease to exist. In the present volume his intention is to show that the plays, especially the great tragedies, are works of art and conform to the fundamental principles. The most important chapters are those on *Othello* and *Hamlet*. In discussing *Othello*, he denies that the psychology, if considered critically and literally, is sound: "if *Othello*," he says, "is a study in psychology and tragic error, then not only he but nearly everybody else in the play must be stupid, and Emilia must be either stupid or disloyal, or else, indeed, a prey to an abrupt and disenchanting intrusion of the plot. And then her conduct is not

probable ; whereas by our interpretation it is, that is (in Croce's sense of the word) *coherent*, in harmony with the whole. How much finer in the poet, and more satisfying to the imagination, that the characters, one and all, should thus be deftly transported into another world, and made subject to the high and all-prevailing purpose of a tragic illusion ; and that the play should be, not a transcript of fact, but, as Pater says, of the poet's sense of fact—not a cluster of studies embedded in a story, but a new creation and an individual, unbroken whole ! ” In the study of *Hamlet*, in which Professor Stoll recapitulates some of what he has written elsewhere, he protests again at the exact psychological dissection of the character and analyses the play as a work of dramatic art in which the psychology is sacrificed to the dramatic effect of the whole, which has the advantage, as he claims, of presenting a Hamlet that is “ stage-fit and fairly intelligible, which the psychologists have never made him ; and of being in keeping with the text, the times, and the dramatic tradition and theatrical favour of two centuries ; and that outweighs, I take it, the critical tradition of a century and a half. Such a Hamlet, above all, is in keeping with the whole play, of which he is only an inseparable component, and with the nature of drama. He is part of the structure, upholding and upheld by the other parts ; and some of the mystery in him is only that of plot, some of it a matter of emotional effect, as his reticence and dignity. He is a dramatic figure, not a psychological study. And if as such he could be accepted as the real Hamlet, he would then, by that very fact, have the greatest advantage attainable, that of relieving a long since weary world—in a play written in comprehensible English, for the popular stage—of the necessity, every little season, of coping with another.”

Professor Stoll is not always easy reading ; in a close discussion concerned more with ideas than facts, constant reference to other works disturbs rather than fortifies the argument. The conclusion of the matter is that “ drama is no document,” but an illusion of reality. “ And Shakespeare is the greatest of dramatists because the illusion he offers is the widest and highest, the emotion he arouses the most irresistible and overwhelming.” It has been said many times before, but is as often forgotten. On the whole the book is a timely and pungent comment on much modern criticism and scholarship.

G. B. HARRISON.

**The Metaphysical Poets : Donne, Herbert, Vaughan, Traherne.** By J. B. LEISHMAN. Oxford, at the Clarendon Press. 1934. Pp. viii+232. 10s.

**Four Metaphysical Poets : Donne, Herbert, Vaughan, Crashaw.** By JOAN BENNETT. Cambridge, at the University Press. 1934. Pp. viii+136. 6s.

THE simultaneous appearance of these two books from the Oxford and Cambridge presses is significant, like the marked attention given to the same poets in Mr. Aldous Huxley's *Texts and Pretexts*, of the contemporary interest in the Metaphysical poets. The design of the two books is similar, but not identical; each is meant to be an introduction for the general reader, and therefore quotes whole poems, but the quotations in Mr. Leishman's book are so many as to constitute it an anthology with explanatory chapters and a running commentary on the poems selected, whereas Mrs. Bennett's book conforms to the more usual type of literary criticism. Both writers are greatly indebted to Professor Grierson's writings. Mr. Leishman quotes largely from him, not always with sufficient discrimination: e.g. on p. 57 he quotes a passage explaining some lines of Donne with a punctuation differing essentially from that printed in the book. Mr. Leishman's chapters on Donne contain many good things, although he passes from subject-matter to style, and back again, in a rather unmethodical way. We seem to detect the manner of the lecture-room in the sentences beginning "Well!"; in one chapter five paragraphs begin "Finally." Mr. Leishman writes well on Herbert's craftsmanship, and emphasizes his humour and reasonableness, qualities which have sometimes been overlooked. In the chapter on Vaughan he might have spared the long quotations from John Evelyn showing his misunderstanding of children and from Mrs. Meynell correcting Evelyn, in order to find room for a fuller treatment of Vaughan's original thoughts on childhood. Mr. Leishman should have warned the reader that some of his quotations from Vaughan's prose are not original but translated from St. Anselm. He is at his best in drawing out the similarities in thought between Traherne and Wordsworth, from whose poems he quotes some 150 lines. Here is a good example of his discernment:

The most remarkable of these [resemblances] . . . is the poem *On leaping over the Moon*, where we may discern that same lack of humour,



that same innocent indifference to conventional associations, and that same intense conviction of the value of an apparently trifling experience . . . , which made *Peter Bell* and certain of the *Lyrical Ballads* appear so incongruous and incomprehensible to their original public, and which still leave those poems hovering between the sublime and the ridiculous (p. 222).

Mr. Leishman has had the help of Mr. Butt for the biographical parts, and he is generally correct, but there are some minor inaccuracies. Mr. Dobell did not invent the title of Traherne's poem *The Ways of Wisdom* (p. 193). The date of Magdalene Herbert's death is 1627 (p. 106). It is most improbable that Herbert saw the Bodleian MS. of *The Temple*. It is misleading to suggest that Herbert from 1609 spent "the next eighteen years" at Cambridge, as he was largely or wholly absent in the later years; nor did Walton spend "most" of the last forty years of his life at Winchester, as his friend Bishop Morley did not go there till 1662, nor did his daughter make her home there till 1678. Vaughan's citation from Romans is not "a paraphrase" but is taken from Beza's Latin translation of the New Testament.

Although it is the smaller book, there is more to interest the advanced student in Mrs. Bennett's book than in Mr. Leishman's serviceable introduction. There are judgments which carry one far: e.g. when she says of Donne: "The metaphysics occur in his poetry as a vehicle, but never as the thing conveyed" (p. 25), or of Vaughan and the others: "To speak familiarly of ultimate things is the prerogative of the metaphysical poets. Their habit of connecting the temporal and the eternal made it possible for them." Mrs. Bennett is successful in showing the continuity of Donne from his earliest love-poetry to his latest religious verse. She remarks of Vaughan that in his earlier secular verse he "never appears to be interested in his subject," and that those poems "only become sensitive and individual when he describes nature"; and when, after his "conversion," he began to explore his religious belief, "he found that it centred in his conception of nature," which accordingly became "the core of his poetry." From Herbert he learnt the value of under-statement, though he never acquired his "exquisite sense of form"; but he achieved a "radiance" which neither Donne nor Herbert had. While Mrs. Bennett admires Crashaw's lyrical gift to the full, she puts her finger on a weak spot when she observes that, whereas Donne and Herbert "tend to over-



elaborate an idea, Crashaw loves to elaborate a sensation," with the consequence that often there is no progress of thought in his poems. She even daringly expresses a doubt "whether a poet in whom the senses and the emotions were so much more active than the intellect was well served by the metaphysical style."

Mrs. Bennett rightly comments on "the very careful punctuation" of Donne and Herbert. It is regrettable that in the case of Herbert she often deserts the punctuation and alignment of the *editio princeps* for Palmer's modernized text.

F. E. HUTCHINSON.

**Peter Sterry, Platonist and Puritan, 1613-1672. A Biographical and Critical Study with Passages Selected from His Writings.** By VIVIAN DE SOLA PINTO. Cambridge: the University Press. 1934. Pp. xiv+242. 12s. 6d.

PROFESSOR PINTO has brought back into notice a very interesting seventeenth-century figure. Peter Sterry is one who "cannot be labelled as philosopher, theologian, visionary or poet," but "who partakes in some degree of all these characters." Professor Pinto conducts an excellent discussion of his life, his theological philosophy, and his prose style. Anybody interested in the seventeenth century will find something to interest him among the miscellaneous information which Professor Pinto has discovered—there are over a hundred Sterry letters or transcripts of letters here made known, for instance. The collection of excerpts from his writings which forms the second part of this book shows him at his best in the way that Mr. L. Pearsall Smith's anthology showed Donne.

The most valuable thing about Sterry is the way he held in balance so many elements which a narrow interpretation would pronounce contradictory. His mind was as open a meeting-place for inconsistencies as the pastoral form in poetry. "O musical Discord," he cries in his *Discourse of the Freedom of the Will*, "and harmonious Contrariety!" In this he resembles Spenser and the early Milton. Sterry is thoroughly versed in Plato, in Christian theology and mysticism, in the arts (from which he draws plentiful imagery) and in pagan and secular poetry, in drama and secular prose (including contemporary French romances). His creed is

Puritan but his phraseology is often Roman—erotic imagery occurs to his mind readily. He is a Roundhead yet one of his favourite epithets is "Princely," and he trims his silken sails at the Restoration. Professor Pinto is on firm ground when he says that "there was as much true culture and more genuine appreciation of art and poetry in a court that included such men as John Milton, Peter Sterry, and Andrew Marvell, as among the small poets and dilettanti of the Whitehall of Charles II."

I do not think that, as a writer of prose, Sterry can be put on any higher level than Traherne the poet—his prose surely is not so good as the best of Traherne's. His imagination works, but its results are frequently similar to each other, and pretty rather than ardent. He has great moments, but he cannot be considered seriously as a rival of Herbert or Vaughan. He is extremely sensitive to movement of light and water, to springing light and to springs of water. But he has no vision comparable to Vaughan's of Eternity, the ring of pure and endless light. His rhetorical manner is important. He seems to deal partly in internal rhymes and assonances. This sermon style is where Elizabethan prose ended, and it is a brilliant destiny. Thanks to this handsome book, Sterry is now assured of his place in any comprehensive history of the seventeenth century.

In line 2 of extract 15 "formeth" apparently should be "formed." The reference to extract 79 at p. 21, note 2, is a "fault escaped."

GEOFFREY TILLOTSON.

**The Clubs of Augustan London.** By ROBERT J. ALLEN. Cambridge (Mass.): Harvard University Press; London: H. Milford. 1933. Pp. xii+305. 12s. 6d. net.

THIS book<sup>1</sup> is a departure from the main tenor of writings about the clubs of the Augustan age, in that it studies them from the literary rather than the social point of view, seeking "to analyse the relation between men of letters and the club life of Swift's time, to see how far a single social phenomenon affected an age famous for its pre-occupation with manners." It shows how the clubs forwarded

<sup>1</sup> A small section on "The Kit-cat Club and the Theatre" appeared in *R.E.S.*, vol. vii., No. 25, p. 56.

patronage, provoked satire, and suggested a literary expedient which was exploited by moralists and satirists alike until, as Thomas Burnet (p. 216) wrote of *The Spectator* to a friend, they "surfeited the world with Clubs."

It must be confessed that diatribes against White's for gaming, or the satire which the political character of the Kit-Cat and other clubs drew from opponents, are of small literary value, with few exceptions, as when Swift took up the pen against the Calves-Head Club or the Kit-Cats. But though, in this respect, the results of his investigations are disappointing, and though he disclaims any attempt to retouch "the vivid pictures of Club life drawn by others," Mr. Allen has written an interesting and informative study. It is based on a careful examination of the writings of the period, both permanent and ephemeral, and the evidence they afford is given due weight and no more.

In a preliminary chapter, which traces the rise of clubs in earlier times, mention of the Ordinary as a contributory cause, in some degree comparable to the Coffee-house later, might have been expected. Among the many clubs, real and imagined, to which the remaining chapters are devoted, none is more interesting than the Scriblerus Club. This receives full treatment, but Aitken's support for restricting its membership to Pope, Gay, Parnell, Swift, and Arbuthnot is perhaps not justifiably claimed in the note on p. 262, as Aitken's words in his *Life and Works of John Arbuthnot*, 1892, are rather ambiguous. He states that the above "were members, and associated with them were Lord Oxford, Bishop Atterbury, and Congreve."

In tracing the connection between the *Memoirs of Martinus Scriblerus* and *Gulliver's Travels*, Mr. Allen cites a deduction that the *Travels* were begun about 1720. The recent publication of Swift's letters to Charles Ford confirms this and finally settles the question of date. On April 15, 1721, Swift wrote: "I am now writing a History of my Travells, which will be a large Volume, and gives Account of Countreyes hitherto unknown" . . . and on August 14, 1725: "I have finished my Travells, and I am now transcribing them; they are admirable Things, and will wonderfully mend the World."

Though the Augustan age is taken as closing with the death of Swift in 1744, some pursuit of the subject into the latter part of the century is necessitated; but this is limited, and the reader will not

find, for instance, more than a passing reference to the clubs founded or frequented by Dr. Johnson, or, since clubs outside London are sometimes referred to, any account of the famous Lunar Society, whose membership included Erasmus Darwin, Thomas Day, and Joseph Priestley, with visitors such as James Watt and Josiah Wedgwood. Among the later material used is Murphy's amusing satire, in his *Gray's Inn Journal*, of the meetings of the Robin Hood Club, which continues the account of that body to 1753. It may be worth while to mention, as an exception, that a favourable reference to this debating club occurs in a scarce poetical tract by W. H. Draper,<sup>1</sup> who was apparently a member. He complains that, himself early abroad, he meets "not one of philosophic turn," and asks where are his companions :

" Enquirers into nature's works, her laws,  
And all the depths and myst'ries of the mind ! "

whom he defines in a note as " Of the *Robin-hood* Society."

The volume is well and correctly printed, and illustrated by a portrait of Jacob Tonson, and five other plates, principally reproductions of satiric engravings aimed at obnoxious clubs. An index with references to works specified in footnotes enables the author to dispense with a bibliography, but it would have been convenient if, as well as references to particular numbers of periodicals, etc., he had given references to collected editions in some cases, *e.g.* for Steele's publications, to the annotated editions of John Nichols, such as *The Theatre*, etc., 2 vols., 1791. Other sources deserving mention are *The Works of Arthur Murphy*, 7 vols., 1786, and for *One Epistle to Mr. A. Pope*, Nichols's edition of Welsted's *Works in Verse and Prose*, 1787.

R. H. CASE.

**The Letters of Jonathan Swift to Charles Ford.** Edited by DAVID NICHOL SMITH, Merton Professor of English Literature in the University of Oxford. Oxford: at the Clarendon Press. 1935. Pp. xlvii+260. 15s. net.

CHARLES FORD, a young Irish gentleman in comfortable circumstances, in his twenty-seventh year, and about to marry, dropped

<sup>1</sup> *The Morning Walk ; or, City Encompass'd. A Poem in Blank verse*, MDCCLI.

his intention, crossed over to London, and cultivated the acquaintance of a clergyman holding Irish preferments and fourteen years his senior, Jonathan Swift. The latter, although he had published anonymously a notorious book which created some stir, was poor and comparatively unknown; Ford, save that he was a good Latinist, was little distinguished from other Irish squires. There was always in Swift, the outcome of early stringency, a strain of frugal severity; Ford loved his bottle and the good things of life. Here was hardly the promise of a lifelong friendship, a sincere liking for each other's company, and, when apart, the interchange of cordial, unaffected letters. But the unexpected is the more probable event. The friendship of Swift and Ford was to prove an unbroken circumstance of both lives. And in this gathering of their letters, edited by Professor Nichol Smith with fine discernment, as also with minute and scholarly thoroughness, we see Swift as we should like to think of him, as his closer contemporaries did in fact regard him, and not as later biographers and historians have transfigured him.

The friendship of these two has been well known to students of Swift and his writings. It has been known that it lasted for over thirty years, that Swift entrusted Ford with some of his literary secrets, that they corresponded at irregular intervals, that Ford's country house was visited by Swift; but only part of their correspondence had been published; and so little was known of Ford and his movements that he remained an indistinct figure. In his *Life of Swift* Craik contented himself with a passing reference to Ford in a footnote and a brief allusion to the amusing complacency of the "little man"—a description borrowed from Mrs. Pilkington's *Memoirs*. Other biographers have been equally indifferent, counting him cursorily with Swift's humble and more obscure acquaintance. Yet he is often mentioned in the *Journal to Stella*; we see that thus early he and Swift were on familiar terms; and over twenty letters, written by either one or the other, have long been in print. Dr. Elrington Ball's great edition of Swift's *Correspondence* presented a more complete and discriminating knowledge of Ford's character and life; but much was still left uncertain.

It was hardly to be hoped that any considerable addition could ever be made to Dr. Ball's six volumes, the outcome of years of research and an unequalled knowledge of Anglo-Ireland. A few stray letters, overlooked in private collections, was all that seemed

probable. Here are, however, not merely a few more letters, but the greater part of a complete budget of familiar correspondence. Dr. Ball was able to print eighteen letters from Ford and six addressed to him by Swift. Dr. Nichol Smith has increased the sum to sixty-nine, and all but nine of these he has printed faithfully from the original manuscripts. Not only is this legacy from time the more welcome as it was wholly unexpected, it proves to be a valuable gift of fortune. These letters are much more than the record of a long friendship; they show the great Dean of St. Patrick's in a character inadequately recognized; they have some minor historical relevance; and they bring to light details of bibliographical and textual importance.

When Ford died, about two and a half years before Swift, his papers passed to his executor, Sir John Hynde Cotton, and have thence descended to our own day in private ownership. So far as can be learned, and there is no reason to doubt it, the collection is intact save for a single inroad, which has, however, done little injury, for the few letters dispersed have, with one exception, been traced. Most of the fifty-one letters written by Swift have remained in this private collection since Ford's death, and all but one are now printed for the first time.

Swift corresponded with more famous friends than Ford, and on subjects of greater general importance; to some he revealed himself more intimately; he wrote, on occasion, with deeper feeling; but with no other friend was Swift on easier and more natural terms. In the last of his letters to Ford preserved to us he writes, "I have never lessened a grain of that true Love and Esteem I ever bore you." Ford cannot have been the pompous, complacent, and tiresome little man and nothing more depicted by Mrs. Pilkington.

The earliest letter from Swift belongs to the end of the year 1708, written in answer to a letter from Ford which has been lost. The unaffected terms of relationship between the two, which were to subsist for life, had already been established. Ford, who had gone back to Ireland, was evidently longing for London again. Swift rallies him on his previous denunciation of London life and on the deceitfulness of past things remembered. "So I formerly used to envy my own Happiness when I was a Schoolboy, the delicious Holidays, the Saterday afternoon, and the charming Custards in a blind Alley; I never considered the Confinement ten



hours a day, to nouns and Verbs, the Terror of the Rod, the bloody Noses, and broken Shins." And throughout the correspondence the strain of allusion to common things and everyday events continues. The strawberries are ruined; the pigs have strayed over a neighbour's corn; he owes a sempstress three or four shillings, but she must wait like her betters. He is in "great Difficultyes how to entertain seven Butchers and Grocers with their Wives and Familyes at a Christmas Dinner"; he has dined alone "on a Bief Stake and Pint of wine" in seven minutes by his watch, "and this is what I often do, to encourage Cheerfulness." There are frequent references to ill-health—"I am forced to entertain you like an old Woman with my Aylments." He chides Ford on the injury his habits are doing him, advising "temperance and exercise," for, although life is not greatly to be valued, "health is worth everything." He regards, or pretends to regard, events in Ireland with indifference—"I look on things here with the same View as I would on Boys at Spanfarthing." And, as is natural from friend to friend, there are repetitions. "You see," writes Swift, "I have the common folly of quoting my self." Apart from their value as an accession to our knowledge of Swift and his contemporaries these letters are very pleasant reading.

Dr. Nichol Smith has been at pains to present us with a more complete portrait of Ford than has hitherto been available. His ancestry, birth, brothers and sisters, personal estate, his movements in middle and later life are now set in a connected narrative. His life might have passed uneventfully had not Swift obtained for him in 1712 the office of Gazetteer—"the prettiest employment in England of its bigness." In this position, which he filled competently, he was a useful political informant. But he lost the appointment with the downfall of the Tories after the death of Queen Anne, and, for a time, crossed over to France. On his return he was arrested and confined, but not for long. In 1715 he was free to visit the continent again and make a leisurely tour as far as Rome. In 1718 he was back in Dublin; but soon dropped into the habits of an absentee landlord, spending nearly all his time in London, with an occasional visit to his Irish estate, Woodpark, where he entertained Swift and Stella. In 1731 he severed even this connection with the country of his birth, letting Woodpark and settling down to leisure and easy living in London. "Charles Ford's mistress is his bottle," wrote Erasmus Lewis. This weak-

ness may not have been unconnected with the fall downstairs, reported by a London paper, which led to his death in April, 1743. For over ten years he and Swift had not met; and their correspondence had fallen into arrears.

Ford's life wanted distinction and incident; his friendship with Swift has alone perpetuated his memory; and fortunately he had the good sense to preserve the Dean's letters and other papers. The letters let us further into the secret of the projected publication of Swift's *Some Free Thoughts upon the Present State of Affairs* and reveal textual revision hitherto unsuspected. They tell us something also of a related pamphlet, *An Enquiry into the Behaviour of the Queen's Last Ministry*. They show that *The Right of Precedence between Physicians and Civilians* should never have been included with the works; that he took no part in the writing of *The Correspondent*; and that *The Puppet-Show*, although Faulkner included it with the poems, is almost certainly not by Swift. There are also important references to *Gulliver's Travels*, which show, even more completely than has hitherto been known, how far Swift took Ford into his confidence in the writing, publication, and textual amendment of the work.

An appendix to the main correspondence printed in Dr. Nichol Smith's volume contains a few letters to Ford from Gay, Pope, Parnell, Bolingbroke, and the Duchess of Ormond. There is also a slight fragment of an unpublished pamphlet wholly in the hand of Swift. But of far greater importance and interest are five poems, two in Swift's hand and three in that of Ford. Ignoring Swift's directions, Ford kept back the original manuscript of *The Bubble*, and sent a transcript to the London printer. This was fortunate, for this piece, running to 220 lines, suffered textual trials, and Swift's copy for the printer is a rare find, although the manuscript cannot be accepted as his final thought, for the varying versions of the 1727 *Miscellanies* and of Faulkner in 1735 were printed with his cognizance. Here also we have the fair copy of Swift's birthday verses to Ford, January 31, 1723, showing fifteen verbal variants from the text printed by Faulkner in 1762, which was probably set up from a rough draft or a copy of it. The fair copy, now brought to light, gives us Swift's final revision and also fixes the date, which was uncertain. Even more important are the three poems in Ford's hand. Forster discovered, among the Fountaine manuscripts, an earlier version of *Vanbrugg's House* than

that printed in the *Miscellanies* of 1711. Among these papers is Ford's copy of this version, apparently from an earlier draft than the Fountaine revision. There is also a copy of the *Directions for a Birth-day Song* with some variants from the version printed by Dean Swift in 1765. But the outstanding paper is a folded half-folio sheet which shows, what nobody had so much as suspected, that the poem printed by Faulkner in 1735, under the title *Stella at Wood-Park*, is really a combination of two poems, which here appear as separate pieces. At some date and by some one, though Dr. Nichol Smith finds it difficult to believe by Swift himself, the shorter poem, *Stella's Distress*, was unskilfully inserted within the other. If Swift was not responsible for the awkward patching he seems to have accepted the printed version without protest, for it is certain that he lent some assistance to Faulkner in the second volume of the *Works*, 1735, which contains the poems. A copy of this volume, annotated by Swift, is in private hands, and no correction or note appears against this particular poem.

In addition to the text of letters and papers, reproduced with a scrupulous care and accuracy, this volume embodies valuable and searching editorial work. The footnotes contain information that is new; they are never overloaded; but equally they never pass over anything that should be explained or put on record. The minutest allusion to person or event is traced; and this is no easy task in a familiar correspondence more than two hundred years old. Those who have long and expectantly awaited the publication of the Ford letters now have their patience amply rewarded.

HAROLD WILLIAMS.

**English Poetry and the English Language : An Experiment in Literary History.** By F. W. BATESON. Oxford : The Clarendon Press. 1934. Pp. viii + 129. 6s. net.

MR. BATESON has written a short book but an important one. Even if his readers will not agree with every point that he makes, the critical importance of what he is doing still remains; and it would be a pity if the vigorous calm with which he taps at the lungs of such distinguished patients as Wordsworth, Tennyson, Arnold, and Professor Housman should prejudice an older generation of readers

against  
Mr. E  
school  
produ  
for is  
("Th  
in the  
writte  
the la  
langu  
in lan  
some  
but a  
A  
ning  
Eliza  
mid-  
centu  
not p  
but I  
sixte  
repet  
and  
langu  
prop  
the l  
cent  
"de  
brief  
far f  
by c  
He  
sugg  
and  
mai  
a la  
pur  
po  
that  
to

against an approach to literary history that holds so much promise. Mr. Bateson believes that the method of the nineteenth-century school of literary historians, who looked upon literature as the product of social forces, has proved inadequate: the thing to look for is the *language* that the poets of any particular period had to use. ("The real history of poetry is, I believe, the history of the changes in the kind of language in which successive poems have been written.") Social and intellectual tendencies work directly upon the language, and only secondarily and indirectly—through the language they have made available—upon the poet. And a change in language means to this writer not merely the introduction of some new terms or a particular emphasis on a few favourite words, but a change in "the manner in which *all* words are used."

Accordingly he takes his way through English literature, beginning with the earlier Elizabethans and proceeding through the later Elizabethans and Metaphysicals to the Augustans, the poets of the mid-eighteenth century, those of the earlier and later nineteenth century, and so finally to those writing at the present day. It is not possible to follow him here through all those various stages; but his method may be illustrated from what he has to say about sixteenth-century poetry. He notes the constant diffuseness and repetition of this poetry, its tendency to produce "a verbal smudge"; and seeking for an explanation he finds it in the fact that the language was in a state of flux and contained at the time "a high proportion of new or partially assimilated words." The effect upon the language of those recent acquisitions was towards the end of the century thoroughly stimulating, but at first they tended only to "decrease its self-confidence." It is difficult to put such a point briefly without making it appear crude: Mr. Bateson, however, is far from being crude, and his arguments are everywhere supported by contemporary evidence that indicates a wide and critical reading. He is particularly happy on the eighteenth century, and the most suggestive section in his book is the chapter on "Poetic Diction and the Sublime"—though it is not easy to see its relevance to his main thesis. Gray and his contemporaries were not so much using a language that came to hand as making one up for their specific purposes. In a later section the dilemma of the nineteenth-century poets is admirably stated; they had inherited a literary language that responded very inadequately to the sort of poetry they wanted to write (the same problem has arisen to-day); and the spoken

language was almost of as little use to them. Some devastating paragraphs follow on the diffuseness and vagueness of mid-nineteenth century poetry; and when the author reaches the twentieth century he continues to be critical and intelligent.

How far his sketch for a new method of literary history is capable of being filled up it is difficult to say. We have here only "the proposals" for a more ambitious work which he hopes one day to write. If such a work can be written Mr. Bateson is well fitted to write it: one wonders only whether the suggestions so originally and persuasively outlined here are capable of being worked out in detail by one man. If the linguistic side of our University schools of English could be persuaded to give rather less of their attention to the roots of the English language and to devote more of it to the leaves it has put forth so abundantly since 1500 there would be far more data for literary scholars like Mr. Bateson to work upon. As things are, he has not only to invent his method, but also to do most of the spadework for it himself.

JAMES R. SUTHERLAND.

#### SHORT NOTICE

**Religious Creeds and Philosophies as represented by Characters in Sir Walter Scott's Works and Biography.** By Dr. K. Bos. H. J. Paris: Amsterdam. 1932. Pp. xii+292. Fr. 4.50.

This is not a satisfactory book. It may be convenient to have assembled in one volume all the references which are here collected, but even so the later chapters are weakened by neglect of the *Letters on Demonology and Witchcraft*, and the author's summaries do little more than point out the obvious. It is perhaps too much to expect any foreigner who is not a theologian to understand the differences between the Church of England, the Church of Scotland, and the various dissenting bodies in both countries; but the historical surveys here are more superficial than they should be in a work of scholarship, and contain definite misstatements, as well as a good deal of confusion. It was, for example, in 1645, not after the death of Charles I., that the use of the Book of Common Prayer was prohibited by the English Parliament; the Acts of the English Restoration Parliament were not, as the author seems to suppose (p. 154), valid in Scotland; and in the eighteenth century, if not immediately after the Revolution of 1688, Scottish Episcopal clergy and laity had to endure more than petty inconveniences. The situation in both countries after the Reformation was far more complicated than he appears to realize, and a good deal of historical knowledge is required for an adequate discussion of Scott's view of events and of the views of his characters.

E. C. B.

## SUMMARY OF PERIODICAL LITERATURE

BY H. WINIFRED HUSBANDS

BULLETIN OF THE JOHN RYLANDS LIBRARY, MANCHESTER, Vol. 19, July 1935—

Miles Coverdale and the English Bible (H. Guppy), pp. 300-28.

Malory's *Morte D'Arthur* in the Light of a Recent Discovery (E. Vinaver), pp. 438-57.

Problems arising out of the Winchester MS.

Hand-list of Additions to the Collection of English MSS. in the J.R.L. (Moses Tyson), pp. 458-85.

ELH, Vol. II, April 1935—

Milton and the Telescope (Marjorie Nicolson), pp. 1-32.

Lady Carey and Spenser (Ernest A. Strathmann), pp. 33-57.

Notes on Middle English Lyrics (Kemp Malone), pp. 58-65.

On lyrics in Carleton Brown's *English Lyrics of the XIIIth Century*.

The Hebrew Hexameter: A Study in Renaissance Sources and Interpretation (Israel Baroway), pp. 66-91.

Chapman's Revisions in his *Iliads* (Phyllis Bartlett), pp. 92-119.

ENGLISCHE STUDIEN, Vol. 70, April 1935 (Karl Luick Festschrift)—

Zur synchronischen Analyse fremden Sprachguts (Vilém Mathesius), pp. 21-35.

Notes on the Runic Stones at Holy Island (A. S. C. Ross), pp. 36-39.

Altengl. *āntid* und seine Sippe (W. Krogmann), pp. 40-45.

Altenglisch *hwæpere* 'dennoch' (W. Horn), pp. 46-48.

Altenglisch *stōr*, ein altirisches Lehnwort (M. Förster), pp. 49-54.

Some Notes on English Place-Names containing Names of Heathen Deities (E. Ekwall), pp. 55-59.

Tysoe Warws; Place-names containing the name Frig.

English Place-Name Compounds containing descriptive nouns in the Genitive (R. E. Zachrisson), pp. 60-73.

Healfdene (Kemp Malone), pp. 74-76.

Origin of the name and its uses; development of legend.

*Beowulf* 457 f.: *For werefyhtum and for ārstafum* (J. Hoops), pp. 77-80.



- Zu den Aktionsarten in Mittenglischen (R. Hittmair), pp. 81-91.  
 Zum syntaktischen Gebrauch des bestimmten Artikels bei Caxton (A. Pirkhofer), pp. 92-101.  
 Zu Chaucer, *Canterbury Tales*, General Prologue, l. 207 (A. Eichler), pp. 102-05.  
 "As brown as a berry."  
 Mittenglische Marienstunden (K. Brunner), pp. 106-09.  
*Hours of our Lady's sorrow*: text and introduction.  
 Zur Textkritik der Stockholmer Medizinhandschrift X. 90 (H. Ch. Matthes), pp. 110-16.  
 A few Back-Formations (O. Jespersen), pp. 117-22.  
 Malapropism (A. E. H. Swaen), pp. 123-28.  
 Klangwirkung und Wortstillung (W. Franz), pp. 129-31.  
 Der rhythmische Charakter der neuenglischen Bibelübersetzung von 1611 (M. Deutschbein), pp. 132-37.  
 The Significance of -'n and -en in Milton's Spelling (H. C. Wyld), pp. 138-48.  
 Elisha Coles's "Synchrisis" (1675) as a Source of Information on 17th Century English (A. Gabrielson), pp. 149-52.  
 Bemerkungen zum Gebrauch einiger neuenglischen Zeitformen (H. Koziol), pp. 153-58.  
 Erlebte Kausalität. Ein Problem der Stilkunde (B. Fehr), pp. 159-66.  
 Arthur Brooke and his Poem (A. Trampe Bödtker), pp. 167-68.  
 Zur Quelle des *Macbeth* (A. Brandl), pp. 169-80.  
 Boethius and Bellenden and Holinshed.  
 Zur Bibliographie und Textgeschichte von Hugh Blair's *Critical Dissertation on the Poems of Ossian* (O. L. Jiriczek), pp. 181-89.  
 Zur Frage des Romantischen in Byron's *Childe Harold's Pilgrimage* (A. Closs), pp. 190-97.  
 Lord Byrons kömische Reime (E. Eckhardt), pp. 198-208.  
 Anglistik und deutsches Volksinteresse. Ein geschichtlicher Rückblick (A. Schröder), pp. 209-20.  
 HERRIGS ARCHIV FÜR DAS STUDIUM DER NEUEREN SPRACHEN, Vol. 167 (New Series 67), June 1935—  
 Hamlets Verschickung nach England (E. Weigelin), pp. 193-200.  
 Lord Berners' Froissart-Übersetzung in ihren Beziehungen zum Original (Fortsetzung und Schluss) (G. Schleich), pp. 201-15.  
 Unveröffentlichte Briefe der Lady Isabella A. Gregory (H. Marcus), pp. 216-22.  
 Runic Rings and Old English Charms (Bruce Dickins), p. 252.  
 Ae. *tintreg(a)* < \* *tind-treg(a)* ? (F. Mezger), pp. 252-53.  
*Beowulf* 648-649 Once More (Hope Traver), pp. 253-56.

# SUMMARY OF PERIODICAL LITERATURE 499

## HUNTINGTON LIBRARY BULLETIN, Number 7, April 1935—

- Penelope Devereux as Sidney's Stella (Hoyt H. Hudson), pp. 89-129.  
Evidence against autobiographical interpretation of the sonnets.
- Early American Copies of Milton (Leon Howard), pp. 169-79.
- Frobisher's Third Voyage, 1578 (George B. Parks), pp. 182-90.  
Record of investors and accounts.

## JOURNAL OF ENGLISH AND GERMANIC PHILOLOGY, Vol. XXXIV., April 1935—

- Sir Gawain and the Green Knight (Elizabeth M. Wright), pp. 157-79.  
Notes on interpretation and vocabulary.
- Pepys's Transcribers (W. Matthews), pp. 213-24.
- The Trinity Manuscript and Milton's Plans for a Tragedy (W. R. Parker), pp. 225-32.

## LIBRARY, Vol. XVI., June 1935—

- The Elizabethan ABC with the Catechism (H. Anders), pp. 32-48.  
With facsimiles of the fragment in the library of Worcester College, Oxford.
- Shrewsbury School Library: its Earlier History and Organization (J. B. Oldham), pp. 49-60.
- Jonathan Swift and the *Four Last Years of the Queen* (Harold Williams), pp. 61-90.  
Further particulars with regard to its publication, and proof of authenticity.
- The Early Nineteenth Century Drama (R. Crompton Rhodes), pp. 91-112.  
Corrections of and additions to Professor Nicoll's hand-list of plays. (To be continued.)
- Medieval Parchment-Making (Daniel V. Thompson), pp. 113-17.

## MEDIUM ÆVUM, Vol. IV., February 1935—

- Two notes on MS. Ashmole 328 (N. R. Ker), pp. 16-19.  
*Byrhtferth's Manual*: dislocation of the contents of pp. 26-40, and loss of a leaf after p. 168.

## MODERN LANGUAGE NOTES, Vol. L., March 1935—

- Spenser's *Urania* (H. G. Lotspeich), pp. 141-46.
- Thomas Edwards and the Editorship of the *Faerie Queene* (Jewel Wurtsbaugh), pp. 146-51.  
His connection with the 1751 edition.
- The Printing of John Hughes' Edition of Spenser, 1715 (Ray Heffner), pp. 151-53.  
Relation of large and small paper editions.
- Two Notes on the Philosophy of "Mutabilitie" (Bretns Stirling), pp. 154-55.

## MODERN LANGUAGE NOTES, March—

Identifications in *Colin Clout's Come Home Againe* (Kathrine Koller), pp. 155-58.

Seventeenth-century marginal notes.

Elizabethan Chivalry and the Faerie Queene's Annual Feast (Ivan L. Schulze), pp. 158-61.

Celebrations of anniversaries of Elizabeth's accession and coronation.

Symbolism in *Faerie Queene*, II. 12 (Charles W. Lemmi), pp. 161-65.

The Serpent and the Eagle in Spenser and Shelley (Charles W. Lemmi), pp. 165-68.

*Faerie Queene*, I. 4. 39, and *Revolt of Islam*, I. 8-14.

A Brace of Villains (Marion Grubb), pp. 168-69.

In *Faerie Queene*, V. 9. 10, and *Arden of Feversham*, II. i.

Kyd's Borrowing from Garnier's *Bradamante* (Marion Grubb), pp. 169-71.

Hotspur's Earthquake (D. C. Allen), pp. 171-72.

Mediæval theory.

The Printer's Copy for *The City-Madam* (A. K. McIlwraith), pp. 173-74.

Evidence that it was in Massinger's autograph.

## — April —

Coleridge Marginalia in Jacobi's *Werke* (J. I. Lindsay), pp. 216-24.

From copy in the University of Vermont.

Lessing and Burnaby (Paul P. Kies), pp. 225-30.

*Die aufgebrachte Tugend* and *The Modish Husband*.

A French Adaptation of *Sandford and Merton* (J.-M. Carrière), pp. 238-42.

By Berquin in 1786-87.

A Smollett Letter (Claude Jones), pp. 242-43.

Sent with a copy of his translation of *Don Quixote* in 1756.

## — May —

The Date of the *Troilus*: and Minor Chauceriana (J. S. P. Tatlock), pp. 277-96.

Arguments against a late date; notes on the *Canterbury Tales*.

The So-Called Prologue to the *Knight's Tale* (Willis J. Wager), pp. 296-307.

Another Analogue to the *Prioresses Tale* (Woodburn O. Ross), pp. 307-10.

In Bromyard's *Summa Praedicantium*.

A Note on Chaucer's Pardoner's Prologue (Edward H. Weatherly), pp. 310-11.

Parallel in a Latin *exemplum*.

# SUMMARY OF PERIODICAL LITERATURE 501

- A Note on the Miller's Prologue (George R. Coffman), pp. 311-12.
- Precious Stones in *The House of Fame* (Howard R. Patch), pp. 312-17.
- A Possible Relation between Chaucer's Long Lease and the Date of his Birth (Hazel A. Stevenson), pp. 318-22.
- A Mediæval French Analogue to the Dunmow Flitch (Chester L. Shaver), pp. 322-25.

## June—

- Proverbs and Proverbial Allusions in Marlowe (M. P. Tilley and J. K. Ray), pp. 347-55.
- Symmetry in Milton's *Samson Agonistes* (W. R. Parker), pp. 355-60.
- Author's Changes in Dryden's *Conquest of Granada*, Part I (G. H. Nettleton), pp. 360-64.
- Dryden's Letter of Attorney (C. O. Parsons), pp. 364-65.  
In favour of George Ward, 14 December 1680.
- A Dryden Anecdote (E. G. Fletcher), p. 366.  
Defoe's story of the Duke of Buckingham.
- The Modena Troupe in England (A. L. Bader), pp. 367-69.  
List of players visiting England in 1678.
- The Plot of Conrad's *The Duel* (J. DeLancey Ferguson), pp. 385-90.  
Details drawn from subconscious memory of newspaper version?
- A Source of Conrad's *Suspense* (Miriam H. Wood), pp. 390-94.  
*Memoirs of the Comtesse de Boigne*.
- Katherine Mansfield and Chekhov (Elisabeth Schneider), pp. 394-97.  
Parallel between "The Child-Who-Was-Tired" and "Sleepyhead."

## MODERN LANGUAGE REVIEW, Vol. XXX., July 1935—

- The Imagery of *The Revengers Tragedie* and *The Atheists Tragedie* (U. M. Ellis-Fermor), pp. 289-301.  
Further evidence of Tourneur's authorship.
- The Influence of the Rolle and Wyclifite Psalters upon the Psalter of the Authorised Version (Laurence Muir), pp. 302-10.
- A Middle English Paraphrase of John of Hoveden's *Philomena* and the Text of his *Viola* (F. J. E. Raby), pp. 339-43.  
From the British Museum MS. Addit. 11307 and Cotton Nero C. ix.
- Sir Gawain and the Green Knight*, ll. 14 ff. (A. Macdonald), pp. 343-44.
- An Early Tudor Grammarian (Beatrice White), pp. 344-47.  
Robert Whittinton.
- Greene's "Ridstall Man" (H. G. Wright), p. 347.  
Further note on *James the Fourth*.
- The Interpretation of a Passage in *Hamlet* (Karl Young), pp. 348-53.  
Punctuation of 1. ii. 186-8 and its significance.

## MODERN PHILOLOGY, Vol. XXXII., May 1935—

*The Woman's Prize, or The Tamer Tamed* (Baldwin Maxwell), pp. 353-63.

Evidence for the date 1611.

On the Genesis of *Pilgrim's Progress* (Daniel Gibson, Jr.), pp. 365-82.  
Prior's *Poems*, 1718: A Duplicate Printing (W. K. Chandler), pp. 383-90.

Shelley's *Leonora* (Frederick L. Jones), pp. 391-95.

History reconstructed from letters of Shelley and Hogg.

Victorian Bibliography for 1934 (W. D. Templeman, C. F. Harrold, Helen C. White and F. E. Faverty), pp. 397-430.

## NOTES AND QUERIES, Vol. 168, May 4, 1935—

Shakespeare, *Lyly* and "Æsop" (H. W. Crundell), p. 312.  
References to the *Scarabeus* fable.

References to Chaucer (Dorothy F. Atkinson), p. 313.  
In *Reyce's Breviary of Suffolk*, 1618, and in *Grafton's Chronicles*.

## ———— May 18—

Words: Additions to the *N.E.D.* (W. Jaggard), p. 349.  
*Sowze*; *evert*; *main*, 'a match at archery . . .'

## ———— May 25—

Notes on the "Parnassus" Plays (R. H. Bowers), p. 368.  
On Latin phrases and quotations.

## ———— June 1—

Wordsworth and Lamb (V.R.), pp. 382-83.  
Notes on the lines "Written after the Death of Charles Lamb."

The Date of *I Henry IV* (J. M. Purcell), pp. 383-84.  
References in Harvey's *Four Letters and certaine Sonnets*, 1592. Note by H. W. Crundell, June 15, p. 424.

Shakespeare and the Trussells of Billesley (M. Dormer Harris), p. 384.  
Possible relationship.

## ———— June 15—

London Slang at the Beginning of the XVIII Century (W. Matthews), pp. 416-18.

Continued June 22, pp. 439-41, and June 29, pp. 454-56.

Dryden's Allusion to the Poet of Excessive Wit (E. N. Hooker), p. 421.  
Identified by Dennis as Wycherley.

# SUMMARY OF PERIODICAL LITERATURE 503

## NOTES AND QUERIES, June 22—

The Miltonic Epitaph on Mazarin (J. Milton French), p. 445.

## June 29—

Keats and the Aeneid (W. H. J.), p. 456.

## PHILOLOGICAL QUARTERLY, Vol. XIV., April 1935—

*De Morte et Amore* (J. G. Fucilla), pp. 97-104.

Translations and imitations of Alciato's Books of Emblems in English and other languages.

Fielding's History of the Forty-Five (Mabel Seymour), pp. 105-25.

English Literature, 1660-1800: A Current Bibliography (L. I. Bredvold), pp. 142-80.

Applause for Dodsley's *Cleone* (C. J. Hill), pp. 181-84.

Graves' Epilogue and references in his letters.

## PUBLICATIONS OF THE MODERN LANGUAGE ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA,

Vol. L., June 1935—

"The Question of Halsam" (Helen P. South), pp. 362-71.

Two fourteenth-century stanzas; identification of the author.

Sidney's *Astrophel and Stella* Reconsidered (T. H. Banks), pp. 403-12.

Arguments against autobiographical interpretation.

Sidney's *Astrophel and Stella* and Greville's *Calica* (J. M. Purcell), pp. 413-22.

Detailed parallels between the two sequences.

The Composition of the *Shepherd's Calendar* (R. B. Botting), pp. 423-34.

Made up in part of earlier poems?

Notes on the Elizabethan *Elegie* (F. W. Weitzmann), pp. 435-43.

Variations in meaning and use of the term.

Milton as a Historian (J. Milton French), pp. 469-79.

Suggesting that Milton's interests were primarily prosaic.

The Latin Pastorals of Milton and Castiglione (T. P. Harrison, Jr.), pp. 480-93.

*Gaudetio de Lucca*: A Forgotten Utopia (L. M. Ellison), pp. 494-509.

Berington's authorship and his intention.

Burns and the Smuggler *Rosamond* (F. B. Snyder), pp. 510-21.

Re-examination of Lockhart's narrative and his sources.

Ritson's Life of Robin Hood (C. C. Moreland), pp. 522-36.

Ritson's methods of investigation and his critical faculty.

The Significance of *Lamia* (J. H. Roberts), pp. 550-61.

A repudiation of the ideal of *Hyperion*?



PUBLICATIONS OF THE MODERN LANGUAGE ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA,  
June—

A Note on Source Influences in Shelley's *Cloud* and *Skylark* (Irving T. Richards), pp. 562-67.

Herrick's *The Hag* and Marvell's *On Paradise Lost*.

A "Lost" Poem by Arthur Hallam (T. H. Vail Motter), pp. 568-75.  
From *The Englishman's Magazine* for August 1831.

Grundtvig's *Index B* of English and Scottish Ballads (S. B. Hustvedt), pp. 595-605.

From the manuscript in the Royal Library at Copenhagen.

An Introduction to the Æsthetics of Literary Portraiture (C. N. Wenger), pp. 615-29.

## REVUE ANGLO-AMÉRICAIN, Vol. XII., February 1935—

Dorothée Wordsworth Ém(ile Legouis), pp. 193-205.

Les "Juvenilia" de Jane Austen (Léonie Villard), pp. 206-18.

*The Scholar Gipsy*, an interpretation (E. K. Brown), pp. 219-25.

## — June—

*Œdipus* and *Othello*: Corneille, Rymer and Voltaire (E. E. Stoll), pp. 385-400.

Parallels in criticism.

Un Hommage oublié d'Anatole France à Keats (A. Digeon), pp. 422-23.

Poem written in 1908.

## REVUE DE LITTÉRATURE COMPARÉE, Vol. 15, April-June 1935—

Shakespeare's Italianate Courtier Osric (J. W. Draper), pp. 289-97.

## TIMES LITERARY SUPPLEMENT, May 2, 1935—

"The Genuine Text" (C. S. Lewis), p. 288.

Relations of Shakespeare's manuscript and the prompt-copy. Replies by F. W. Bateson, May 9, p. 301; by J. D. Wilson, May 16, p. 313; by C. S. Lewis and W. J. Lawrence, May 23, 331; by J. D. Wilson and M. R. Ridley, May 30, p. 348; by W. W. Greg and W. J. Lawrence, June 6, p. 364; by J. D. Wilson, June 13, p. 380.

"Loving Ballad of Lord Bateman," 1839 (W. T. Spencer), p. 288.

Authorship of the text. Reply by A. M. Cohn, quoting parallel of "Young Baker" (1790), May 16, p. 313; rejoinder by W. T. Spencer, June 6, p. 364; note by S. Hodgson, June 13, p. 380.

A Swift Epitaph? (E. L. Allhusen), p. 288.

Verses in manuscript book of 1809. Reply by H. Williams, discrediting the ascription, May 9, p. 301.

## — May 9—

Attributions to Rochester (Harold Brooks), p. 301.

Authorship of "The Commons' Petition" and "Upon the Author of the Play call'd Sodom."

# SUMMARY OF PERIODICAL LITERATURE 505

Milton and the Rabbinical Bible (Theodor Gaster), p. 301.  
Milton's Rabbinical knowledge not necessarily drawn from a specific source.

A Criticism by Coleridge (Alfred Hart), p. 301.  
On Parnell's *Historical Apology for the Irish Catholics*.

The Augustan Age (J. Isaacs), p. 301.  
History and early use of the phrase.

— May 16—

Carlyle and Ruskin, (M. H. Goldberg) p. 313.  
Comparison of autograph and printed text of Carlyle's letter of October 29, 1860.

— May 23—

The Venerable Bede : Ascension Eve 735-1935, pp. 317-18.  
Early Modern English Dictionary (Hope Emily Allen), p. 331.  
Some problems. Reply by Rose Macaulay, May 30, p. 348.

Gabriel Harvey's Vocabulary (J. M. Purcell), p. 331.  
Words not in the *N.E.D.*

"Allan Cunningham's " Byron in America (Davidson Cook), p. 336.  
Bibliographical note.

— May 30—

The Date of the "Ode to Duty" (E. H. Hartsell), p. 348.  
Evidence that it was written not later than September 1804. Note by Nowell Smith, June 20, p. 399.

— June 6—

Thomas Hearne, pp. 353-54.  
Pope's Lost Sermon on Glass-Bottles (N. Ault), p. 360.  
Identification of Sermon referred to by Jervas. Further notes by E. Heath and C. W. B., June 13, p. 380; by G. Sherburn, discrediting Pope's authorship, June 20, p. 399; by J. R. Sutherland, June 27, p. 416. Reply by N. Ault, July 4, p. 432; rejoinder by G. Sherburn, July 11, p. 448.

The Drapier's Letters (Harold Williams), p. 364.  
Faulkner's note to Letter IV.

Letters of Lawrence Sterne (Margaret R. B. Shaw), p. 364.  
Lydia Médalle's treatment of her father's letters.

Timothy Bright's "Characterie" (M. Zamich), p. 364.  
Disadvantages of the system for reporting plays.

— June 13—

A Scots Sermon-Squib (W. Fraser Mitchell), p. 380.  
"The Red-Shankes Sermon," 1642. Note by W. E. Wilson, June 20, p. 399; by H. W. Meikle, July 4, p. 432.

John Fisher and Thomas More (M. G. S. Sewell), p. 380.  
Fisher's sense of humour.

## UNIVERSITY EXAMINATION RESULTS, 1935

### *B.A. with Honours in English Language and Literature.*

#### BELFAST.—English Literature :

*Class I.*—Moirá F. Doolan, Elizabeth M. W. McKee.

*Class II.*—*Div. 2* : Margaret G. Cormack.

*Class III.*—Margaret M. Stewart.

#### BIRMINGHAM.—English :

*Class I.*—W. H. O. Challinor, Mary Alexander.

*Class II.*—*Div. 1* : Catherine D. Dunlop, G. McDonald, Olive E. Simister, Marjorie F. Wood, Lorna R. Woodall. *Div. 2* : Dorothy Bosworth, F. Partridge, Audrey R. F. Southam, R. B. Wright.

*Class III.*—Freda Jones, E. Parker, R. F. Price, Clarice Ward, D. D. Whitmore.

#### BRISTOL.—English :

*Class I.*—L. C. Ford, K. W. Salter, A. F. Winton.

*Class II.*—*Div. 1* : Grace A. Broad, W. C. Discombe, Kathleen M. Hill, J. W. Musson. *Div. 2* : Olga A. G. Bennell, Agnes M. M. Cleeton, Mary Cooper, W. S. Johnson, Winifred C. M. Ryder, Sylvia L. St. Hill, F. G. Searle, Marjorie J. Thomas, W. B. Young.

*Class III.*—H. W. Case.

#### CAMBRIDGE.—English Tripos, Part I :

*Class I.*—E. L. Black (Cath.), R. B. Cook (Joh.), M. Evans (Cath.), W. H. Mellers (Down.), E. C. Pettet (Joh.).

*Class II.*—*Div. 1* : H. L. Bradbrook (Down.), H. B. Forster (King's), E. A. Goodwyn (Down.), P. Greaves (Fitzw.), L. S. Jones (Trin.), J. H. Phillipson (Trin.), R. Tatton Brown (Pet.), F. C. Tinkler (Down.). *Div. 2* : P. Barlow (Cla.), E. P. Bates (King's), E. G. Braithwaite (Trin. H.), J. B. Browne (Queen's), L. W. Clark (Pet.), E. L. Clegg (Down.), J. R. Crook (Christ's), P. A. G. Dixey (Trin.), J. A. M. Ede (King's), G. K. Embleton (Sid. Suss.), C. R. Fincken (Sid. Suss.), W. K. Gibson (Selw.), D. C. L. Holland (Trin.), L. S. Howarth (Cath.), W. T. Loke (King's), J. S. L. Lyon (Trin. H.), J. D. McCaughey (Pemb.), I. C. McIver (Cla.), J. M. Montgomery (Trin.), A. N. L. Munby (King's), K. Peake-Jones (Emm.), K. E. Richardson (Trin.), C. W. Robert (Down.), E. L. Rodick (Pemb.), A. B. Scott (Cath.), I. K. Shearer (Sid. Suss.), J. Shotter (Pet.), B. Simon (Trin.), L. N. Smith (Sid. Suss.),

# UNIVERSITY EXAMINATION RESULTS, 1935 507

M. A. Staniforth (Christ's), B. H. Symes (Trin.), G. C. Tacchi (Emm.), J. V. Taylor (Trin.), R. J. Todd (Emm.), F. R. P. Vinter (King's), W. E. Wade (King's), C. A. P. Winsor (Cath.), J. G. Young (Emm.).

*Class III.*—R. G. Balls (Pemb.), J. C. Bune (Cath.), J. F. B. Chitty (Emm.), S. P. W. Corbett (King's), H. J. Creedy (Cath.), G. H. D. Davis (Cath.), B. Dhingra (Queens'), S. H. Dixon (Pemb.), R. Dumbreck (Pemb.), R. F. H. Duncan (Down.), G. H. Eagar (Down), J. F. Faupel (Christ's), R. W. de F. Feachem (Down.), E. F. Hall (King's), G. Y. Hann (Magd.), A. W. R. Hughes (Christ's), J. M. K. Maitland (Magd.), J. R. Moon (Trin. H.), M. T. Owen (Fitzw.), D. S. Palmer (Queens'), R. L. Peel (Queens'), B. Pomfret (Fitzw.), E. D. L. Shaw (Down.), J. C. Skinner (Pemb.), M. H. B. Solomon (Christ's), F. A. Stirling (Sid. Suss.), J. F. Turner (Pemb.), E. W. Tyson (Fitzw.), S. A. Williams (Cath.), H. A. D. Wilmer (King's), R. P. Wissler (Cai.), R. W. Woods (Trin.), A. V. Yates (Christ's), J. D. S. Young (Pemb.).

## WOMEN

*Class I.*—H. R. Ellis (Newn.).

*Class II.*—*Div. 1*: M. G. Boxley (Girton), B. Fletcher (Newn.), J. M. F. Penny (Girton). *Div. 2*: M. M. Butler (Girton), J. M. Easton (Girton), R. Freeman (Girton), K. Hunter (Newn.), L. B. Lloyd (Girton), J. MacArthur (Newn.), E. I. May (Newn.), E. M. Molony (Girton), H. M. Newsom (Newn.), E. A. Norwood (Newn.), E. D. Sheridan (Girton), B. N. Smith (Newn.), P. C. E. Vernon (Newn.), V. d'A Wimperis (Newn.).

*Ægotat.*—P. Nanavutty (Girton).

## PART II

*Class I.*—C. F. Beckingham (Queens'), J. E. Breen (Christ's), R. G. Cox (Down.), J. F. Danby (Jes.), G. H. Durrant (Jes.), A. G. Reynolds (Queens'), L. G. Salinger (Emm.), G. Walton (Down.), A. J. Warner (Cath.).

*Class II.*—*Div. 1*: E. E. T. Bradford (Fitzw.), A. Jowett (Cath.), R. E. F. Moloney (Jes.), A. Montgomery (Christ's), I. E. M. Morrison (Trin.), R. J. Rees (Selw.), J. F. A. Roberts (Pemb.), H. G. Wayment (King's). *Div. 2*: S. W. Beer (Down.), A. B. Collishaw (Queens'), H. J. FitzGerald (Christ's), T. O. Greenough (Pet.), J. Horsley (King's), H. C. McComas (Cai.), H. C. Nash (Pemb.), R. Openshaw (Fitzw.), H. B. Richardson (Pemb.), W. Salt (Trin. H.).

*Class III.*—A. B. Beaumont (Cla.), J. M. Bryan (Trin.), B. S. Drewe (Joh.), W. D. Hardy (Pemb.), B. H. Mehta (Joh.), H. R. W. Roberts (Cla.), G. R. Samuel (Cath.), N. I. Samuel (Fitzw.), J. H. Stephens (Pet.), A. R. M. Walker (Cath.).

*Ægotat.*—O. E. Crosthwaite-Eyre (Trin.).

## WOMEN

*Class I.*—H. M. Howes (Newn.), H. M. Mennie (Newn.).

*Class II.*—*Div. 1*: C. Cole (Newn.), R. D. Fox (Newn.), R. D.

Frere (Newn.), F. M. Rowe (Newn.), K. M. M. Smith (Girton), N. E. Taylor (Girton). *Div. 2* : B. Baur (Girton), N. R. Blakesley (Newn.), S. Guiton (Newn.), J. I. Kellett (Newn.), H. A. Miller (Girton), F. Orde (Girton), M. E. Twist (Girton), M. I. Weiss (Newn.), D. M. Wilson (Girton), M. C. Wing (Newn.).

DURHAM.—English :

*Class I.*—D. F. Nicholson (Arms.), D. W. Wain (Univ.).

*Class II.*—*Div. 1* : D. H. Curry (Bede), Esther E. Hall (Arms.), F. S. Langstaff (Univ.), Sylvia C. Leyden (Arms.), R. W. Murphy (Arms.), Winifred Purdy (Arms.), C. B. Russel (Arms.), W. Smith (Univ.), A. Steel (St. John's). *Div. 2* : G. Bowman (Bede), J. R. Brown (Arms.), C. I. Gray (Arms.), Dorothy Page (Arms.), C. T. Potter (Arms.), Cecilia Smith (Arms.), Beatrice M. Taylor (St. Mary's), Mary E. Walshe (Arms.), J. Walton (Hatf.).

*Class III.*—H. C. Banks (Arms.), Veronica Jackson (Arms.), Annie G. Ruell (Arms.), J. J. Winn (Arms.).

LEEDS.—English :

*Class II.*—Mary Bacon, Lucy M. Butterworth, Esther D. Clarke, Kathleen M. M. F. Cowley, Muriel E. Fletcher, Muriel Heron, Irene M. Holmes, Joyce M. Patterson, Kate E. Penty, Grace M. Smith, Margaret Turner.

*Class III.*—Dora M. Grisdale, Margaret N. Maguire, J. J. A. Newman, Mary L. Quayle.

LIVERPOOL.—English :

*Class I.*—Florence M. Booth, R. D. Buckels, Cecilia Connolly, A. F. Eccles, Nancy M. Jones, Margaret G. Owen, H. J. Rooney, L. Whitworth, Margaret E. Williams.

*Class II.*—*Div. 2* : M. Murphy, J. Swift.

LONDON (Internal).—English :

*Class I.*—C. W. E. Cave (King's), F. Coventry (King's), Eveline Dudley (Westfield), Eugenie J. A. Henderson (U. C.), L. J. Jolley (U. C.), Dorothy A. Taylor (Westfield).

*Class II.*—*Div. 1* : Dorothy F. Bartholomew (Westfield), Doris Burton (Bedford), Iris Craig (King's), Betty Dobinson (King's), Lorna Downie (U. C.), Phyllis M. Eavis (Westfield), Veronica Hartley (U. C.), Mabel E. D. Havell (Holloway), Hilda M. Hulme (U. C.), Adrienne A. E. M. Leever (U. C.), E. G. Lester (King's), E. B. Moss (U. C.), Florence M. Northend (Bedford), Freda M. Richardson (Bedford), E. L. Thurley (Q. M. C.), Winifred M. M. Wickins (Bedford). *Div. 2* : E. C. Allen (King's), Maisie Bannerman (King's), Marjorie I.

# UNIVERSITY EXAMINATION RESULTS, 1935 509

Biss (U. C.), Constance G. Blevin (Holloway), Winifred A. Bowler (Bedford), Edna D. Clark (Q. M. C.), Marjorie E. Dean (Bedford), Barbara J. Gadd (Holloway), Dorothy M. G. Galer (King's), Marjorie J. Goodes (U. C.), M. Grattidge (U. C.), Mary Guy (U. C.), Joyce E. Hancock (U. C.), Hilda M. Harrison (Bedford, Birkbeck), E. H. Horrocks (King's), Violet M. S. Hubert (Bedford), Sylvia K. M. Huggler (U. C.), Kathleen L. Hyde (King's), Enid D. Jermyn (Bedford), J. O. P. Jones (King's), Thelma A. M. Jonsson (Westfield), Dorothy E. King (Westfield), M. Lebel (King's), Lucy E. Manley (U. C.), Barbara D. Medhurst (U. C.), Florence C. Meech (Q. M. C.), R. A. Moffat (U. C.), C. W. Newman (Q. M. C.), Doris B. Nicholls (Q. M. C.), J. F. Parsons (Q. M. C.), W. T. Paske (King's), Lyndall F. Pearce (U. C.), Edith M. Punchard (Westfield), R. G. Ralph (King's), Margaret H. Rayment (King's), Joan A. Read (Bedford), Eileen E. M. Renwick (Holloway), Maggie Riley (Bedford), Janet Robinson (King's), Leila M. Robinson (U. C.), Ruth H. Simonis (U. C.), Olive E. Skinner (U. C.), Ida F. Snowden (Holloway), Mary K. Southwell (King's), Barbara Sullivan (U. C.), Helen C. A. Tripp (U. C.), E. H. Venn (Q. M. C.), J. H. Vetch (King's), Dorothy C. Walton (Holloway), Marian E. Waters (King's), Barbara Watson (Bedford).

*Class III.*—E. J. Barnes (King's), N. F. Button (King's), Patricia K. Byrne (Q. M. C.), Jessy I. M. Challis (King's), Theodora J. Churchill (Westfield), Grace F. Collins (King's), Lydia M. Dann (U. C.), J. L. Dowley (King's), Helen J. M. Edmiston (U. C.), E. L. G. Giles (Birkbeck), Edith B. Hooper (U. C.), W. Islip (Birkbeck), Kathleen M. Kaye (Bedford), W. J. Lawrence (King's), Gwyneth M. Lewis (King's), Norah L. Morphew (U. C.), Avis H. Morris (U. C.), Elsa M. H. Smith (King's), M. Toll (King's).

## LONDON (External).—English :

*Class I.*—Mary E. Clare (U. C. South.), A. H. Lawley (U. C. Nott.), J. Mackay (U. C. Nott.), J. R. Reed (King's and Priv.), Kathleen M. Shawcross (Priv.), Margaret P. Smith (U. C. Ex.).

*Class II.*—*Div. 1* : Ruth Daniels (U. C. Nott.), E. Hilton (Priv.), Muriel A. Legge (Portsmouth M. C.), H. F. Maybank (Priv.), Mary Petherbridge (U. C. South.), J. H. Slatcher (Priv.), W. G. Waller (U. C. South.). *Div. 2* : D. E. Brown (College of St. Mark and St. John), J. F. G. Earney (Portsmouth M. C.), Edith L. Hammond (U. C. Leic. and Priv.), C. H. Holdgate (U. C. Hull), O. A. G. Jackson (Priv.), Marjorie J. Kent (Portsmouth M. C.), A. E. Lindsay (U. C. Hull), H. B. Moyse (U. C. Ex.), Kathleen M. Northcott (Priv.), Elizabeth A. Page (Priv.), F. G. Seal (Priv.), R. A. Standing (Brighton Tech. Coll.).

*Class III.*—Gwenda E. L. Andrews (Priv.), A. Boyle (Priv.), Catherine Brennan (Priv.), Ella M. Deall (Priv.), Eleanor G. Hooper (U. C. Ex.), Barbara L. M. Jenks (U. C. South.), R. I. Levy (U. C. Hull), T. E. Lloyd (Priv.), J. Madden (Priv.), A. M. Milne (Priv.), Margaret E. Smith (Portsmouth M. C.), Dorothy A. Swire (Priv.), Iris E. Twidell (Priv.), Ella G. Wiseman (U. C. South.).



## MANCHESTER.—English Language and Literature :

*Class I.*—W. Lister.

*Class II.*—*Div. 1* : Dora Bannister, Catherine M. Fothergill, J. C. Garner, Eileen Haddakin, Joyce Harland, Barbara Hope-Jones, Barbara M. Jessop. *Div. 2* : R. L. Barker, G. Barlow, C. A. B. Brand, Audrey E. Clanchy, W. A. Cross, Margaret Cutcliffe, Gwladys M. Fielding, D. Kelly, J. A. H. Malcolm, Florence M. Mather, Nora Short, Emma Snowden, Mary K. Taylor.

*Class III.*—Kathleen Dickinson, Georgina Fairhurst, Eileen Marshall, A. M. Taylor.

## OXFORD.—English Language and Literature :

*Class I.*—J. A. W. Bennett (Mert.), M. D. Hutchison (Magd.), J. A. E. Mulgan (Mert.), A. E. Outram (New.), Alice M. Grutter (St. Hug.), Isobel M. Gunn (Som.), Margery L. E. Turner (Som.), Margaret A. Williams (H.-S.).

*Class II.*—R. A. Atthill (Trin.), M. H. Barsley (Keble), P. C. Birkinshaw (St. Edm. Hall), J. B. L. Bunce (Mert.), R. M. Campbell (Magd.), L. Dawson (Univ.), R. Duder (Univ.), P. H. Edmonds (St. Cath.), A. Greenaway (Jesus), M. M. R. Haig (St. Peter's), B. R. Lam (D. Jo. Bapt.), L. O. Madan (St. Cath.), T. M. Morgan (Ball.), D. S. M. Robb (Wadh.), P. H. Rogers (St. Edm. Hall), I. L. Serrailier (St. Edm. Hall), N. Smith (St. Peter's), V. S. Tilak (St. Cath.), T. D. Tosswill (Exeter), D. P. Wallace (Ch. Ch.), B. Young (Univ.), Mavis C. Barnett (H.-S.), Kathleen D. Baron (Som.), Betty J. Beaven (Som.), Rosemary Billinton (H.-S.), Winifred Bradshaw (St. Hild.), Renee D. M. Drucquer (St. Hild.), Clodagh A. Dulanty (L. M. H.), Cicely E. C. Fraser (L. M. H.), Elsie E. Herron (St. Hug.), Helene M. Ingleby Smith (L. M. H.), Rosamund Jenkinson (L. M. H.), Joan S. Lumsden (St. Hug.), Helen Martin (St. Hild.), Rose Montague Carson (H.-S.), Annie M. S. Morwood (L. M. H.), Monica Moss (H.-S.), Christine Munro (H.-S.), Phoebe M. M. Nance (St. Hild.), Marcelle A. R. Pitt (H.-S.), Margaret P. Reekie (St. Hug.), Ellen M. T. Rice (St. Hild.), Joan R. Rice (L. M. H.), Rosemary Roberts (L. M. H.), Margaret E. Thorpe (L. M. H.), Alison M. W. West-Watson (H.-S.), Kathleen Wilson (H.-S.), Margaret O. Woodward (H.-S.), Cecily M. Woolley (L. M. H.).

*Class III.*—S. E. Andrews (D. Jo. Bapt.), P. Bowles (Hertf.), G. R. Branch (Ball.), J. F. C. Brown (St. Peter's), B. G. Chubb (Exeter), G. H. R. Dent (Keble), M. P. Dobson (Keble), C. W. S. Ellis (Bras.), H. J. Godiwala (Hertf.), N. F. Hidden (Bras.), A. Jenkins (St. Edm. Hall), I. Kishimoto (Mert.), R. W. P. Lory (Worc.), P. N. L. Lycett (Oriol), A. H. Mahler (Trin.), M. W. Malim (Magd.), R. Mehta (Oriol), A. P. Morice (St. Edm. Hall), S. J. Orme (Keble), H. A. Perry (Ball.), L. W. Sheppard (Mert.), J. H. Vinden (Exeter), R. W. L. Watts (Keble), H. D. Willcock (Queen's), Kathleen L. Box (H.-S.), Joan E. M. Burke (Som.), Freda Clarkson (Som.), Martina M. Corfe (Som.), Joan W. Cox (St. Hild.), Margaret D. M. Dalby (H.-S.), Susannah M. H. Davies (St. Hug.), Ellen B. Endicott (H.-S.), Emmeline M. E. Esdaile (St. Hild.),

## UNIVERSITY EXAMINATION RESULTS, 1935 511

Mary I. Foster (St. Hug.), Alison V. Gordon (St. Hug.), Phyllis E. Greenwood (H.-S.), Helen E. Hanson (L. M. H.), Ruth M. Jones (St. Hild.), Ruth E. L. Lane-Smith (H.-S.), Mary F. T. McDonald (H.-S.), Helen M. McGuire (L. M. H.), Ruth Radford (L. M. H.), Veronica M. Sharrock (L. M. H.), Alma N. Stevenson (St. Hug.), Ursula J. Torday (L. M. H.).

*Class IV.*—J. M. Draper (Ball.), H. H. Katzenbach (St. Cath.), C. P. Lee (Exeter), A. C. Lewis (D. Jo. Bapt.), J. H. T. McClintock (Keble), E. F. Pipe (St. Cath.), G. H. Puranik (St. Cath.), A. G. Rhodes (Mert.), I. M. Sciortino (St. Edm. Hall), J. K. Smart (Bras.), W. A. Williams (Jesus), Alison Hope (Som.), Margaret M. Ross (St. Hug.), Joan P. M. Rowe (H.-S.).

READING.—English :

*Class II.*—Daphne Dann, Marian F. Jackson, Mary S. Milligan.

SHEFFIELD.—English Language and Literature :

*Class I.*—A. W. Adams, R. V. Branston, H. G. Earnshaw, Mabel E. Gowshall.

*Class II.*—*Div. 1* : F. W. Bowen, Eileen M. Ellis. *Div. 2* : Shelagh M. Edwards, Edith M. Owen.

*Class III.*—F. Baker.

WALES.—English :

*Class I.*—R. B. Davies (Card.), C. L. Germanacos (Aber.), Eileen Griffith (Card.), E. G. Jewell (Swan.), E. L. John (Swan.), A. D. Lewis (Aber.), G. O. Roberts (Ban.), T. J. Williams (Card.).

*Class II.*—*Div. 1* : Sheila N. W. Bartlett (Card.), Phyllis L. Bennett (Card.), Sybil E. Bowen (Card.), J. Edwards (Card.), Avarina M. Evans (Aber.), A. T. Evans (Card.), Megan Evans (Card.), L. E. Griffiths (Aber.), Muriel Haworth (Aber.), Dorothy M. B. Higgins (Aber.), G. Hodgkins (Ban.), Gwenllian Hughes (Aber.), W. G. Hurlow (Card.), Margaret N. James (Aber.), E. M. Jones (Swan.), G. Jones (Aber.), S. R. Jones (Card.), Enid E. Lewis (Card.), Elizabeth A. Rees (Aber.), J. A. Sugden (Card.), Marion E. T. Thomas (Card.), Dorothy E. Tomlins (Swan.), Aneurin R. Williams (Card.), Myra Williams (Card.). *Div. 2* : Margaret M. Bibey (Card.), Agnes G. Curzon (Card.), Annie E. Fleming (Card.), Lilian M. Johns (Swan.), W. H. Jones (Ban.), D. G. Lewis (Aber.), Nesta M. Lewis (Card.), Edith Manson (Ban.), Nancy G. Morgan (Aber.), Dora M. K. Pinches (Card.), A. D. Rees (Swan.), Gwenllian N. Samuel (Card.), A. G. Stevens (Card.), Megan Thomas (Card.), Mary E. Talden (Aber.).

### SCOTLAND (M.A.)

ABERDEEN.—English Language and Literature :

*Class I.*—Dorothy C. L. Hackett, D. Martin, Agnes D. F. Ritchie.

*Class II.*—J. M. Couper, Isabel M. Carrow, E. Cow, Brouwen J. Jones, A. A. P. Milne, C. H. E. Ross, J. H. G. Ross.

*Class III.*—J. R. Asher, S. D. Mair.

EDINBURGH.—English :

*Class I.*—J. B. Caird, Doreen D. Fraser, Charlotte A. Reid, Helen M. Turner.

*Class II.*—Agnes A. M. Bee, G. Brodlie, Frances E. O. Gourlay, Janet H. Kirkwood, Florence G. A. N. Liddle, J. E. M'Combes, Barbara M. Pearce, G. Reynolds, J. N. S. Stewart, Grace M. Thomson, Winifred N. Turner.

# ERRATUM

Vol. XI, p. 266, l. 32, *for teaching read* treachery.

Abercr  
Ælfric  
Allen,  
Lon  
Anders  
work  
Den  
noti  
Art a  
E. I  
Athels  
revi  
Aureli  
kno  
Auster  
edit  
104

Bacon  
Len  
Baker  
Bates  
the  
not  
Batho  
104  
Beau  
Bon  
anc  
Becki  
Re  
Benn  
Po  
Cr  
Bensl  
"Be  
art  
Bibli  
Pe  
ye  
Bisse  
of  
Boas  
Dr  
3

# INDEX

Abercrombie, L., review by, 220  
 Ælfric, *see* Göhler, T.  
 Allen, R. J., his *Clubs of Augustan London* reviewed, 487  
 Anders, H., his *Die Bedeutung Wordsworthscher Gedankengänge für das Denken und Dichten von John Keats* noticed, 375  
*Art and Artifice in Shakespeare*, by E. E. Stoll, reviewed, 482  
 Athelston, edited by A. McI. Trounce, reviewed, 112  
 Aurelius, Marcus, his *Meditations*, knowledge of in England, 137  
 Austen, Jane, her *Volume the First*, edited by R. W. Chapman, reviewed, 104  
 Bacon, *The Classic Deities in*, by C. W. Lemmi, reviewed, 474  
 Baker, E. A., review by, 368  
 Bateson, F. W., his *English Poetry and the English Language* reviewed, 494 ; notice by, 373  
 Batho, Edith C., reviews and notice by, 104, 237, 375  
 Beaumont, F., article by R. Warwick Bond *On Six Plays in "Beaumont and Fletcher, 1679,"* 257  
 Beckingham, C. F., note on *Othello and Revenge for Honour*, 198  
 Bennett, Joan, her *Four Metaphysical Poets: Donne, Herbert, Vaughan, Crashaw* reviewed, 484  
 Bensley, E., reviews by, 92, 214  
 "Beowulf" and *Germanic Exorcism*, article by G. Hübener, 163  
*Bibliography of British History, Tudor Period, 1485-1603*, edited by Conyers Read, reviewed, 115  
 Bissell, F. D., Jr., his *Fielding's Theory of the Novel* reviewed, 101  
 Boas, F. S., his *Introduction to Tudor Drama* reviewed, 218

Bond, R. P., his *English Burlesque Poetry, 1700-1750*, reviewed, 231  
 Bond, R. Warwick, article *On Six Plays in "Beaumont and Fletcher, 1679,"* 257  
 Bonner, A., his *Place-Names of Surrey* reviewed, 246  
*Book-Pirates, Elizabethan*, by C. B. Judge, reviewed, 475  
 Bourl'honne, P., his *George Eliot* reviewed, 237  
 Braddy, H., his reply to J. M. Manly's review of his *Historical Background of the Parlement of Foules*, 204  
 Brettell, R. E., review by, 221  
 Brett-Smith, H. F. B., review by, 351  
 Brittons *Bowre of Delights (1591)*, edited by H. E. Rollins, reviewed, 96  
 Brooks, H., note entitled "When did Dryden write *MacFlecknoe*?" 74  
 Budd, F. E., article on *Shakespeare, Chaucer, and Harsnett*, 421  
*Burlesque Poetry, English, 1700-1750*, by R. P. Bond, reviewed, 231  
 Bush, D., his *Mythology and the Renaissance Tradition in English Poetry* reviewed, 214  
 Byrom, H. J., note on some lawsuits of Nicholas Udall, 457 ; reviews by, 96, 228  
 Byron, Lord, his association with the *Villa Diodati*, 51  
 Camden, C., Jr., note on the physiognomy of Chaucer's Thopas, 326  
 "Canterbury Tales," *The Manuscripts of Chaucer's*, by Sir W. McCormick and Janet E. Heseltine, reviewed, 342  
*Cardinal Newman and William Froude, F.R.S. A Correspondence*, edited by G. H. Harper, reviewed, 105  
 Case, R. H., review by, 487

- Chambers, Sir E. K., arguments by E. E. Stoll against his dating of *The Malcontent*, by J. Marston, 42; note on the date of *Kubla Khan*, 78, review by, 93; comment on Mrs. Davies' note "The Revelation to the Monk of Evesham," 330; *The Oxford Book of Sixteenth Century Verse*, chosen by him, reviewed, 220
- Chambers, R. W., his *Thomas More* reviewed, 472
- Chapman, G., his *Byron's Tragedy* and MS. Egerton 1994..186
- Chapman, R. W., his edition of Jane Austen's *Volume the First* reviewed, 104
- Charlton, H. B., see *Ratseis Ghost*.
- Chaucer, G., article by F. E. Budd on *Shakespeare, Chaucer and Harsnett*, 421; note by C. Camden, Jr., on the physiognomy of Thopas, 326; reply by H. Braddy to J. M. Manly's review of his *Historical Background of the Parlement of Foules*, 204; J. M. Manly's rejoinder, 209; *Chaucer's Use of Proverbs*, by B. J. Whiting, reviewed, 342; *The Complete Works of Geoffrey Chaucer*, ed. F. N. Robinson, reviewed, 346; *The Manuscripts of Chaucer's "Canterbury Tales"*, by Sir W. McCormick and Janet E. Heseltine, reviewed, 342
- Chettle, H., see article *On the authenticity of "Greene's Groatsworth of Wit,"* etc., 28
- Clark, W. S., article on *Milton and the "Villa Diodati,"* 51
- Clubs, *The, of Augustan London*, by R. J. Allen, reviewed, 487
- Clyde, W. M., his *Struggle for the Freedom of the Press from Caxton to Cromwell* reviewed, 242
- Coate, M., review by, 115
- Coleridge, S. T., note by Sir E. K. Chambers on the date of *Kubla Khan*, 78
- Collins, A. S., review by, 243
- Companion to Shakespeare Studies, A*, ed. by H. Granville-Barker and G. B. Harrison, reviewed, 93
- Cupid's Whirligig*, alterations in, 69
- Darbishire, Helen, review by, 362
- Davenport, A., note on John Weever's *Epigrammes* and the Hall-Marston quarrel, 66
- Davies, Constance, note on *The Revelation to the Monk of Evesham*, 182, see p. 330
- Day, Mabel, reviews by, 344, 346
- Dedications and Prefaces, An Anthology of Elizabethan*, by Clara Gebert, reviewed, 228
- Defoe, D., article by H. W. Häusermann on *Aspects of Life and Thought in "Robinson Crusoe,"* 299, 439
- Die Altenglische Version des Halitgar'schen Bussbuches*, ed. J. Raith, reviewed, 371
- Digby, Lord George, article by G. W. Whiting on *Milton's Reply to Lord Digby*, 430
- Digby, Sir Kenelm, note on his criticism of Spenser, by Jewel Wurtsbaugh, 192
- Diodati, Jean, and Milton, 54-5
- Dodds, J. W., his *Thomas Southerne, Dramatist* noticed, 373
- Donne, J., see Leishman and Bennett.
- Drama, article by B. R. Pearn on *Dumb-Show in Elizabethan Drama*, 385; *An Introduction to Tudor Drama*, by F. S. Boas, reviewed, 218; *English Restoration Drama*, by M. Ellehauge, reviewed, 351; *Italian Popular Comedy. A study in the Commedia dell'Arte, 1560-1620*, with special reference to the English Stage, by K. M. Lea, reviewed, 82; *The Lost Plays and Masques: 1500-1642*, by Gertrude M. Sibley, reviewed, 89
- Dryden, J., article by R. G. Ham on *Dryden as Historiographer Royal*, 284; note by H. Brooks on when Dryden wrote *MacFlecknoe*, 74
- Dumb-Show in Elizabethan Drama*, article by B. R. Pearn, 385
- Dyer, Sir Edward, note by B. M. Wagner on new poems by Sir Edward Dyer, 466
- Eccles, M., review by, 89
- Edinburgh Essays on Scots Literature*, by members of the University of Edinburgh, reviewed, 241

- Edwards, H. L. R., article on *John Skelton : A Genealogical Study*, 406
- Egerton MS. 1994, note on the anonymous masque in, by J. D. Jump, 186
- Eighteenth-century verse, *Points in Eighteenth-Century Verse*, by I. A. Williams, reviewed, 118
- Eliot, George, *Essai de biographie intellectuelle et morale, 1819-1854*, by P. Bourl'honne, reviewed, 237
- Elizabethan Love Conventions, by Lu E. Pearson, reviewed, 230
- Ellehaug, M., his *English Restoration Drama* reviewed, 351
- English Burlesque Poetry, 1700-1750, by R. P. Bond, reviewed, 231
- English Poetry and the English Language, by F. W. Bateson, reviewed, 494
- Evans, B. Ifor, his *English Poetry in the Later Nineteenth Century* reviewed, 239; review by, 358
- Everett, Dorothy, reviews by, 33, 112
- Evesham, *The Revelation to the Monk of*, note by Constance Davies, 182; comment by E. K. Chambers, 330
- Exorcism, Germanic, and "Beowulf," 163
- Faust and Faustus : A Study of Goethe's Relation to Marlowe*, by O. Heller, noticed, 374
- Ferguson, W. D., his *Influence of Flaubert on George Moore* reviewed, 368
- Ferrabosco, Alphonso, note by W. L. Renwick, 184
- Fielding, H., *Fielding's Theory of the Novel*, by F. O. Bissell, Jr., reviewed, 101; *Henry Fielding, Novelist and Magistrate*, by B. M. Jones, reviewed, 101
- Fleire, The*, alterations in, 70
- Fletcher, J., article by R. Warwick Bond *On Six Plays in "Beaumont and Fletcher, 1679,"* 257
- Florio, J., *John Florio. The Life of an Italian in Shakespeare's England*, by Frances A. Yates, reviewed, 347
- Ford, C., *The Letters of Jonathan Swift to Charles Ford*, ed. D. N. Smith, reviewed, 489
- Francis Wills, *The History of*, article by A. Lytton Sells, 1
- Frolic and the Gentle, The, A Centenary Study of Charles Lamb*, by A. C. Ward, reviewed, 360
- Froude, W., and Cardinal Newman, an edition of their correspondence, by G. H. Harper, reviewed, 105
- Gebert, Clara, her *Anthology of Elizabethan Dedications* reviewed, 228
- Göhler, T., his *Lautlehre der Hexameronhomilie des Abtes Ælfric* noticed, 374
- Goldsmith, O., article on the attribution to him of *The History of Francis Wills*, 1
- Gover, J. E. B., his *Place-Names of Northamptonshire and Place-Names of Surrey* reviewed, 246
- Granville-Barker, H., see *A Companion to Shakespeare Studies*.
- Greene, R., article by H. Jenkins *On the authenticity of "Greene's Groatsworth of Wit" and "The Repentance of Robert Greene,"* 28
- Greg, W. W., review by, 475
- Hall, J., note on his quarrel with John Marston, 66
- Hallett, Rt. Rev. Mgr. P. E., review by, 472
- Ham, R. G., article on *Dryden as Historiographer-Royal : The Authorship of "His Majesties Declaration Defended," 1681.* 284
- Hamer, D., reviews by, 474, 479
- Hamlet*. See *Shakespeare*.
- Harper, G. H., his edition of *Cardinal Newman and William Froude, F.R.S., a Correspondence* reviewed, 105
- Harrison, G. B., see *A Companion to Shakespeare Studies*; review by, 482
- Harsnett, S., article by F. E. Budd on *Shakespeare, Chaucer, and Harsnett*, 421
- Häusermann, H. W., article on *Aspects of Life and Thought in "Robinson Crusoe,"* 299, 439
- Heller, O., his *Faust and Faustus* noticed, 374
- Herbert, G., article on the possibility of his authorship of *Jacula Prudentum*, by H. G. Wright, 139; see *Leishman*, and *Bennett*.



- Heseltine, Janet E., her *Manuscripts of Chaucer's "Canterbury Tales"* reviewed, 342
- His Majesties Declaration Defended, 1681*, article on the authorship of, by R. G. Ham, 284
- Historiographer-Royal, the post of, article on *Dryden as Historiographer-Royal*, by R. G. Ham, 284
- History of Francis Wills, The*, article by A. Lytton Sells, 1
- History, Bibliography of British History. Tudor Period, 1485-1603*, edited by Conyers Read, reviewed, 115
- Holmstedt, G., his ed. of *Speculum Christiani* reviewed, 331
- Hübener, G., article on "*Beowulf*" and *Germanic Exorcism*, 163
- Hunt, L., article by M. Roberts on his place in the Reform Movement, 1808-1810.. 58
- Hutchinson, Rev. Canon F. E., review by, 484
- Hyder, C. K., his *Swinburne's Literary Career and Fame* reviewed, 366
- Italian Popular Comedy (1560-1620)*, by K. M. Lea, reviewed, 82
- Jacula Prudentum*, article on the authorship of, 139
- Jenkins, H., article *On the authenticity of "Greene's Groatsworth of Wit" and "The Repentance of Robert Greene,"* 28
- Johnson, F. R., his *Critical Bibliography of the Works of Edmund Spenser printed before 1700* reviewed, 479
- Johnson, S., article on *The Reception of Johnson's Prose Style*, by W. V. Reynolds, 145; *A Johnson Handbook*, by Mildred C. Struble, reviewed, 103; *Johnson's England: an Account of the Life and Manners of his Age*, by A. S. Turberville, reviewed, 233.
- Jones, B. M., his *Henry Fielding, Novelist and Magistrate* reviewed, 101
- Jones, R., his publication *Brittons Bower of Delights (1591)*, edited by H. E. Rollins, reviewed, 96
- Judge, C. B., his *Elizabethan Book-Pirates* reviewed, 475
- Jump, J. D., note on the anonymous masque in MS. Egerton 1994.. 186
- Keats, J., *Keats' Craftsmanship*, by M. R. Ridley, reviewed, 362
- King, R. W., review by, 360
- Kubla Khan*, the date of Coleridge's, note by Sir E. K. Chambers, 78
- Lamb, C., *The Frolic and the Gentle*, by A. C. Ward, reviewed, 360
- Lautlehre der Hexameron-homilie des Abtes Ælfric*, by T. Göhler, noticed, 374
- Lawrence, W. J., note on the site of the Whitefriars Theatre, 186
- Lea, K. M., her *Italian Popular Comedy. A study in the Commedia dell'Arte, 1560-1620, with special reference to the English Stage* reviewed, 82
- Lee, R., his *Princess of Cleve* and sentimental comedy, note by T. B. Stroup, 200
- Leech, C., note on the plays of Edward Sharpham: alterations accomplished and projected, 69
- Leishman, J. B., his *Metaphysical Poets: Donne, Herbert, Vaughan, Traherne* reviewed, 484; reviews by, 98, 105
- Lemmi, C. W., his *Classic Deities in Bacon: A Study in Mythological Symbolism* reviewed, 474
- Lotspeich, H. G., his *Classical Mythology in the Poetry of Edmund Spenser* reviewed, 92
- Ludwig Tieck and England*, by E. H. Zeydel, noticed, 375
- McCormick, Sir W., his *Manuscripts of Chaucer's "Canterbury Tales"* reviewed, 342
- MacFlecknoe*, date of, note by H. Brooks, 74
- Macgregor, D. C., review by, 241
- McKerrow, R. B., a note regarding Shakespeare's manuscripts, 459; review and notice by, 118, 373

- McMaster, Helen N., article on *Vaughan and Wordsworth*, 313
- Mack, Frances M., her ed. of *Seinte Marharete þe Meiden ant Martyr* reviewed, 337
- "*Malcontent, The*," *The Date of*, article by E. E. Stoll, 42
- Manly, J. M., reply to his review of *The Historical Background of the Parlement of Foules*, by H. Braddy, 204; J. M. Manly's rejoinder, 209
- Marston, J., article by E. E. Stoll on *The Date of "The Malcontent"*, 42; note on his quarrel with John Hall, 66; *The Plays of John Marston*, in three volumes, ed. H. Harvey Wood, Vol. I reviewed, 221
- Masques, note on the anonymous masque in MS. Egerton 1994, by J. D. Jump, 186
- Mawer, A., his *Place-Names of Northamptonshire and Place-Names of Surrey* reviewed, 246
- May, T., note on him with reference to his journalistic activities by C. H. Wilkinson, 195
- Middle English, *Athelston*, edited by A. McI. Trounce, reviewed, 112
- Milton, J., article by W. S. Clark on *Milton and the "Villa Diodati"*, 51; article by W. R. Parker on *Some Problems in the Chronology of Milton's Early Poems*, 276; article by G. W. Whiting on *Milton's Reply to Lord Digby*, 430
- Monthly Review, The, First Series, 1749-89*, by B. C. Nangle, reviewed, 357
- Moore, G., *Influence of Flaubert on George Moore*, by W. D. Ferguson, reviewed, 368
- More, Thomas, by R. W. Chambers, reviewed, 472
- Morley, Edith J., review by, 239
- MS. Egerton 1994, masque in, 186
- Murphy, A., possible author of *The History of Francis Wills*, 22
- Mythology, *Classical Mythology in the Poetry of Edmund Spenser*, by H. G. Lotspeich, reviewed, 92; *Mythology and the Renaissance Tradition in English Poetry*, by Bush, reviewed, 214
- Nangle, B. C., his *Monthly Review* reviewed, 357
- Newman, Cardinal, and W. Froude, an edition of their correspondence by G. H. Harper, reviewed, 105
- Nineteenth Century, English Poetry in the Later*, by B. Ifor Evans, reviewed, 239
- Noble, R., review by, 353
- North, Christopher (John Wilson), by Elsie Swann, reviewed, 358
- Northamptonshire, *The Place-Names of*, by J. E. B. Gover, A. Mawer, and F. M. Stenton, reviewed, 246
- Novel, The Epistolary*, by G. F. Singer, reviewed, 356
- Oldham, J., and *MacFlecknoe*, 75-8
- Osgood, C. G., letter in reply to D. Hamer's review of *The Variorum Spenser*, 81
- Othello and Revenge for Honour*, note by C. F. Beckingham, 198
- Oxford Book of Sixteenth Century Verse, The*, chosen by E. K. Chambers, reviewed, 220
- Padelford, F. M., letter in reply to D. Hamer's review of *The Variorum Spenser*, 81
- Page, Nadine, review by, 230
- Parker, W. R., article on *Some Problems in the Chronology of Milton's Early Poems*, 276
- Parlement of Foules, The, The Historical Background of*, by H. Braddy; his reply to J. M. Manly's review, 204
- Pearn, B. R., article on *Dumb-Show in Elizabethan Drama*, 385
- Pearson, Lu E., her *Elizabethan Love Conventions* reviewed, 230
- Pinto, V. de S., his *Peter Sterry, Platonist and Puritan, 1613-1672*, reviewed, 486; reviews by, 101, 109
- Place-Names*, see Northamptonshire and Surrey
- Poetry, note by B. M. Wagner on new poems by Sir Edward Dyer, 466; *Burlesque Poetry, 1700-1750*, by R. P. Bond, reviewed, 231; *English Poetry and the English Language*, by F. W. Bateson, reviewed, 494;

- English Poetry in the Later Nineteenth Century*, by B. Ifor Evans, reviewed, 239; *Four Metaphysical Poets*, by Joan Bennett, reviewed, 484; *The Metaphysical Poets*, by J. B. Leishman, 484; *The Oxford Book of Sixteenth Century Verse*, chosen by E. K. Chambers, reviewed, 220
- Points in Eighteenth-Century Verse. A Bibliographical and Collector's Scrap-Book*, by I. A. Williams, reviewed, 118
- Pope, A., *The Early Career of Alexander Pope*, by G. Sherburn, reviewed, 354
- Praz, M., his *Romantic Agony*, reviewed, 109
- Prefaces, *see* *Dedications*
- Press, Freedom of, *see* *Clyde*
- Princess of Cleve, The*, and *Sentimental Comedy*, note by T. B. Stroup, 200
- Purney, T., edition of his works by H. O. White, reviewed, 98
- Raith, J., his *Die Altenglische Version des Hailtgar'schen Bussbuches* reviewed, 371
- Ratseis Ghost, or the Second Part of his Madde Prankes and Robberies* [1605], reproduced in facsimile with an introduction by H. B. Charlton, noticed, 373
- Read, Conyers, his edition of *Bibliography of British History Tudor Period, 1485-1603*, reviewed, 115
- Reaney, P. H., review by, 246
- Reform Movement, The, 1808-1810*, article by M. Roberts on Leigh Hunt's place in, 58
- Renwick, W. L., note on Alphonso Ferrabosco, 184
- Repentance of Robert Greene, The*, 28
- Restoration Drama, English*, by M. Ellehaug, reviewed, 351
- Restoration, *The: Songs from the Restoration Theatre*, by W. Thorp, reviewed, 353
- Revenge for Honour*, note by C. F. Beckingham, suggesting the author knew *Othello* well, 198
- Reynolds, W. V., article on *The Reception of Johnson's Prose Style*, 145
- Ridley, M. R., his *Keats' Craftsmanship* reviewed, 362
- Roberts, M., article on *Leigh Hunt's Place in the Reform Movement, 1808-1810*, 58
- "*Robinson Crusoe*," *Aspects of Life and Thought in*, article by H. W. Häusermann, 299, 439
- Robinson, F. N., his ed. of *The Complete Works of Geoffrey Chaucer* reviewed, 346
- Rollins, H. E., his edition of *Brittons Bowre of Delights (1591)* reviewed, 96
- Romantic Agony, The*, by M. Praz, reviewed, 109
- Rose, W., notices by, 374, 375
- Sanders, C., questions authenticity of *Greene's Groatworth of Wit*, 28
- Schücking, L. L., article on *The Churchyard-Scene in Shakespeare's "Hamlet," v.i. An Afterthought?* 129
- Scots Literature, Edinburgh Essays on*, by members of the University of Edinburgh, reviewed, 241
- Seinte Marharete pe Meiden ant Martyr*, ed. Frances M. Mack, reviewed, 337
- Sells, A. Lytton, article on "*The History of Francis Wills*": *A Literary Mystery*, 1
- Shakespeare, W., article on *The Churchyard-Scene in Shakespeare's "Hamlet," v.i. An Afterthought?* by L. L. Schücking, 129; article by F. E. Budd on *Shakespeare, Chaucer, and Harsnett*, 421; article by E. E. Stoll on *The Date of "The Malcontent"*—whether this was preceded by *Hamlet*, 42; note by C. F. Beckingham on *Othello and Revenge for Honour*, 198; note by R. B. McKerrow regarding Shakespeare's manuscripts, 459; *Art and Artifice in Shakespeare*, by E. E. Stoll, 482; *A Companion to Shakespeare Studies*, ed. by H. Granville-Barker, and G. B. Harrison, reviewed, 93; *John Florio: The Life of an Italian in Shakespeare's England*, by Frances A. Yates, reviewed, 347
- Sharpham, E., note by C. Leech on his plays with regard to alterations accomplished and projected, 69

- Sherburn, G., his *Early Career of Alexander Pope* reviewed, 354
- Sibley, Gertrude M., her *Lost Plays and Masques: 1500-1642* reviewed, 89
- Singer, G. F., his *Epistolary Novel* reviewed, 356
- Sixteenth Century Verse, The Oxford Book of*, chosen by E. K. Chambers, reviewed, 220
- Shelton, John: *A Genealogical Study*, article by H. L. R. Edwards, 406
- Smith, D. N., his ed. *The Letters of Jonathan Swift to Charles Ford* reviewed, 489
- Songs from the Restoration Theatre*, by W. Thorp, reviewed, 353
- Southerne, Thomas, Dramatist*, by J. W. Dodds, noticed, 373
- Speculum Christiani*, ed. G. Holmstedt, reviewed, 331
- Spens, Janet, review by, 218
- Spenser, E., note by Jewel Wurtsbaugh on Sir Kenelm Digby's criticism of Spenser, 192; letter from F. M. Padelford and C. G. Osgood in reply to D. Hamer's review of *The Variorum Spenser*, 81; *Classical Mythology in the Poetry of Edmund Spenser*, by H. G. Lotspeich, reviewed, 92; *A Critical Bibliography of the Works of Edmund Spenser, printed before 1700*, by F. R. Johnson, 479
- Stenton, F. M., his *Place-Names of Northamptonshire and Place-Names of Surrey* reviewed, 246
- Sterry, Peter, *Platonist and Puritan, 1613-1672*, by V. de S. Pinto, reviewed, 486
- Stoll, E. E., article on *The Date of "The Malcontent": A Rejoinder*, 42; his *Art and Artifice in Shakespeare* reviewed, 482
- Stroup, T. B., note on *The Princess of Cleve* and *Sentimental Comedy*, 200
- Struble, Mildred C., her *Johnson Handbook* reviewed, 103
- Struggle for the Freedom of the Press from Caxton to Cromwell, The*, by W. M. Clyde, reviewed, 243
- Style, article on the reception of S. Johnson's prose style, 145
- Summary of Periodical Literature*, by H. Winifred Husbands, 121, 249, 376, 497
- Surrey, The Place-names of*, by J. E. B. Gover, A. Mawer, F. M. Stenton, and A. Bonner, reviewed, 246
- Sutherland, J. R., reviews by, 354, 356, 357, 494
- Swann, Elsie, her *Christopher North (John Wilson)* reviewed, 358
- Swift, J., *The Letters of Jonathan Swift to Charles Ford*, ed. D. N. Smith, reviewed, 489
- Swinburne, A. C., *Swinburne's Literary Career and Fame*, by C. K. Hyder, reviewed, 366
- Taylor, J., and T. May, 195
- Thopas, Sir*, note by C. Camden, Jr., on the physiognomy of Thopas, 326
- Thorp, W., his *Songs from the Restoration Theatre* reviewed, 353
- Tillotson, A., reviews by, 103, 233
- Tillotson, G., reviews by, 231, 486
- Traherne, T., see Leishman, and Bennett.
- Trounce, A. McL., his edition of *Athelston* reviewed, 112
- Tudor Drama, An Introduction to*, by F. S. Boas, reviewed, 218
- Turberville, A. S., his *Johnson's England: an Account of the Life and Manners of his Age* reviewed, 233
- Udall, N., note on some lawsuits in which he was concerned, by H. J. Byrom, 457
- Vaughan, H., article by Helen N. McMaster on *Vaughan and Wordsworth*, 313; see Leishman, and Bennett.
- "*Villa Diodati*," *Milton and the*, article by W. S. Clark, 51
- Volume the First*, by Jane Austen, edited by R. W. Chapman, reviewed, 104
- Wagner, B. M., note on new poems by Sir Edward Dyer, 466
- Walker, Alice, reviews by, 82, 347
- Ward, A. C., his *The Frolic and the Gentle* reviewed, 360

- Weever, J., note on his *Epigrammes* and the Hall-Marston Quarrel, 66
- White, H. O., his edition of *The Works of Thomas Purney* reviewed, 98
- Whitefriars Theatre, note on its site, by W. J. Lawrence, 186
- Whiting, B. J., his *Chaucer's Use of Proverbs* reviewed, 342
- Whiting, G. W., article on *Milton's Reply to Lord Digby*, 430
- Wilkinson, C. H., note on Thomas May, 195
- Williams, H., review by, 489
- Williams, I. A., his *Points in Eighteenth-Century Verse. A Bibliographer's and Collector's Scrap-book* reviewed, 118
- Wilson, John, *see* North, Christopher.
- Wood, H. Harvey, his ed. of *The Plays of John Marston* (Vol. I) reviewed, 221
- Wordsworth, W., article by Helen N. McMaster on *Vaughan and Wordsworth*, 313; *Die Bedeutung Wordsworthscher Gedankengänge für das Denken und Dichten von John Keats*, by H. Anders, noticed, 375
- Wrenn, C. L., reviews and notice by, 331, 371, 374
- Wright, H. G., article on *Was George Herbert the author of "Jacula Prudentum"?* 139; review by, 366
- Wurtsbaugh, Jewel, note on Digby's criticism of Spenser, 192
- Yates, Frances A., her *John Florio* reviewed, 347
- Zeydel, E. H., his *Ludwig Tieck and England* noticed, 375

